

PRIZE
CATECHISM

ON THE
PRINCIPLES AND POSITION

OF
The Reformed Presbyterian Church.

BY THE
REV. SAMUEL SIMMS,
LOUGHBRICKLAND.



Nec lumen consumetur.

BELFAST: M. POLLOCK. PAISLEY: ALEX. GARDNER.
EDINBURGH: MOODIE AND LOTHIAN.
GLASGOW: R. S. BROWN.

1858.

BX
9092
.S56
1858

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

PRIZE CATECHISM

ON THE

PRINCIPLES AND POSITION

OF

The Reformed Presbyterian Church.

BY THE

REV. SAMUEL SIMMS,

LOUGHBRIKLAND.



Nec solum conseruabatur.

BELFAST: M. POLLOCK. PAISLEY: ALEX. GARDNER.
EDINBURGH: MOODIE AND LOTHIAN.
GLASGOW: R. S. BROWN.

1858.

BX
9092
556
1858

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

The Church,	PAGE 5
-----------------------	-----------

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, 11

CHAPTER III.

DOCTRINES PROFESSED BY THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Classification of Doctrines—Mode of Classification.
The Doctrines of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are—

I. Scriptural,	36
II. Evangelical,	38
III. Protestant,	42
IV. Presbyterian,	48
V. Covenanting,	62
VI. And they have a regard to man in his civil relations,	89

CHAPTER IV.

PRACTICE INCULCATED BY THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Faith and Works—The Standard of Christian Practice, &c.	99
---	----

I. Duties which the Christian (more especially) owes to God,	101
1. Personal Duties,	<i>ib.</i>
2. Domestic Duties,	102
3. Private Social Duties,	103
4. Public Social Duties,	105
II. Duties which the Christian owes to himself,	108
III. Duties which the Christian owes to others,	109

CHAPTER V.

RELATIONS SUSTAINED BY THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

I. Distinguishing Principles,	113
II. Grand Distinguishing Principle of the Covenanted Reformation,	115
III. Relations sustained to the State,	116
IV. Relations sustained to other Presbyterian Churches,	127
V. Conclusion.—Prospects of the Reformed Presbyterian Church,	147

PREFATORY NOTE.

IN 1853, three prizes, of £25, £5, and £3 each, were offered for the three best Catechisms on the Principles and Position of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. The competition was open to the entire membership of the Church; and the manuscript to which the first prize might be awarded was to be "the property of the projectors, and available for publication by them." In the month of June, 1854, the adjudicators—the Rev. Stewart Bates, D.D., the Rev. John Graham, and the Rev. James Ferguson, who had been assumed in place of the Rev. Andrew Symington, D.D., deceased—gave their award, and adjudged the second prize to the writer of the following pages.

The author deems it dutiful to state, that it was through the kindness of the adjudicators

that his production was allowed to be put in competition with the others at all, inasmuch as, from an attack of illness about a month previous to the time when the manuscripts should have been handed in, he was unable to comply with the condition of the promoters of the scheme, which required the manuscripts to be forwarded on or before a certain day.

The following is an extract of a letter received by the author from Dr. Bates, dated Glasgow, October 12, 1854 :—

“The adjudicators will cheerfully give a joint recommendation to each of the Catechisms, and they will be happy to see both published; but they will undertake nothing of superintendence or responsibility on behalf of either production. The adjudicators have agreed to recommend to the promoters of the scheme to pay £20 to the writer of the first Catechism, and £10 to the writer of the second.”

The latter recommendation was complied with by the promoters; but a joint recommendation from the adjudicators was not solicited by the author.

After allowing his manuscript to lie by for a number of years—the reason for which delay

it is not necessary to state—the author would now respectfully submit his little work to the Christian public, and more especially to the friends of the Covenanted Reformation, with the fervent prayer that the God of our fathers may arise and plead His own cause, and make Zion a praise in the whole earth.

SAMUEL SIMMS.

LOUGHBRICKLAND, *Sept. 2, 1857.*

CATECHISM.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH.

QUES. 1. *What is the word used in Scripture, which we translate Church?*

ANS. In the Old Testament it is KEL, and in the New Testament *ecclesia*.

2. *Has not the term Church various significations in the Divine Word?*

Yes, it has. 1. It is used to denote the Church invisible, or the whole number of the elect; 2, it is used to denote the universal Church visible; 3, it denotes a single congregation; and, also, several congregations under one ecclesiastical judicatory.

3. *Is the whole body of the elect spoken of in Scripture as the Church?*

Yes; Christ is said to "love the Church," to be "the Saviour of the body," and to present to himself "a glorious Church," &c. (Ephes. v. 23, 27.)

4. *Is the Catholic visible Church spoken of as the Church?*

Yes; in Acts vii. 38, ii. 47, and 1 Cor. xii. 28, we read of "the Church in the wilderness," of the Lord "adding to the Church" such as should be saved, and of God having "set in the Church" Apostles, &c.

5. *Is the term used to denote a single congregation of Christians?*

It is; as when we read of "the Churches of Asia," and "the Church in the house."

6. *Is not the term also applied to several congregations united under one judicatory?*

Yes; in this sense must be understood the expression "the Church" at Jerusalem (Acts viii. 1); and "the Church" at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 2), as in these cities, it is evident, there were more than one congregation (1 Cor. xiv. 34.)

7. *Do we not also apply the term to a particular branch of the Catholic visible Church?*

Yes; we are accustomed to speak of "the Church of Scotland," the "Free Church," the "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland," the "Reformed Presbyterian Church," &c.

8. *Is there any example in Scripture in which the term Church is used as above?*

I think not. According to the institution of Christ, the Church is one among all nations (Ephes. iv. 3—4), and although the erection of distinct judicatories may be necessary for

the more convenient edification of the saints, "it is the sin and loss of professed Christians to establish distinctions which destroy the unity of the visible Church."

9. *May a particular branch of the visible Church ordain laws or establish a practice, which militates against the unity of the Catholic visible Church?*

Not without being guilty of virtual schism.

10. *Is the Reformed Presbyterian Church guilty of schism in maintaining a position distinct from the other Churches by which she is surrounded?*

Although this has been sometimes insinuated, the very reverse is the case, as no branch of the visible Church manifests a greater desire for Christian union.

11. *How does this appear?*

It is evident from the very position of this Church, inasmuch as she professes adherence to the whole work of the second Reformation, which was commenced and carried on with the express design of securing "uniformity in religion between the Churches of Christ in the kingdom of Scotland, England, and Ireland."

12. *Do you look upon the second or Covenanted Reformation, as Scriptural in its character.*

Although not perfect, "that work (the Covenanted Reformation) embodied the noblest realization of Scriptural principle, applied both

to civil and ecclesiastical affairs, anywhere to be found since the days of the "Divine theocracy over Israel."

13. In what respect is the adherence of the Reformed Presbyterian Church to the cause of the second Reformation, a friendly challenge to other evangelical Churches, to prosecute the subject of Christian union?

It must be evident to all that, were the various evangelical denominations in the British isles to fall back upon that Reformation, a high degree of union and uniformity would be at once secured.

14. Would it not be the duty of the Protestant Churches to take such a step?

No step that could be taken, would serve so effectually to revive religion, and roll back the tide of Popish aggression which has set in so violently upon our land.

15. Does not the Evangelical Alliance serve all valuable purposes that could be associated with a revival of the British Covenants?

The Evangelical Alliance, although a most valuable association, can never subserve the objects contemplated by the framers of the British Covenants. This will be manifest if it be borne in mind that the Evangelical Alliance is a voluntary association of individuals to agree to differ in regard to various important truths, and also to co-operate on the basis of truths held in common, whereas, in the Refor-

mation accomplished in connexion with the British Covenants, the ideas of *nationality*, and to a certain extent, *uniformity*, were kept in view.

16. *Might not the Evangelical Alliance be made to subserve valuable purposes, in leading back the nation to an espousal of the principles contained in the British Covenants?*

Yes; this might be accomplished by the various evangelical denominations resolving in a prayerful manner, *to examine their differences*. Co-operation, wherein religious bodies agree, is not more necessary than candid examination, wherein they differ, without which, indeed, it is not easy to conceive how the prediction of the prophet can be realized, when it is said, "Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice, with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion."

17. *In the meantime, while there are diversities of view among the professed people of God, what is the duty of the respective denominations composing the Catholic Church Visible?*

It is their duty to entertain the idea of the unity of the Church, and to seek after its accomplishment; to co-operate on common ground; "to reform abuses, and endeavour after conformity to the plan of Church order appointed by Christ, that the Catholic Church may attain to the unity of the Spirit, and become visibly connected in the bond of peace" (Ephes. ii. 21.)

18. *Is it not one of the most important objects the Reformed Presbyterian Church should keep in view, to display to the nation the principles of the second Reformation?*

It is; the aspects of Divine Providence present a loud call to all who love the good old way of our father's testimony, to use every approved method to extend a practical knowledge of the principles embodied in the second Reformation—those noble principles which, on more than one occasion, have served to free our land from Popish domination, and which will again, we believe, exalt the British isles to a position of high moral and religious dignity among the nations of the earth.

19. *What is the design of the present Catechism?*

It is to present a brief but comprehensive view of "the truths held in common with other Christian denominations, and in particular, such as are specially professed and maintained by the Reformed Presbyterian Church, as these are founded in the Word of God, developed in past history, and exhibited in the Testimony of the Church."

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMED PRESBY- TERIAN CHURCH.

20. *Can antiquity, in any way, affect the value of truth?*

Mere antiquity, the idol to which so many modern ecclesiastics bow, can add no value to falsehood, but when found on the side of truth, it presents a pleasing view of the Divine faithfulness in preserving the Church in all generations.

21. *Is not the Reformed Presbyterian Church one of the oldest or rather the oldest evangelical denomination in the British Isles?*

Yes; notwithstanding surmises to the contrary, this Church can trace her history back to the purest times of the ancient Protestant, Presbyterian, Covenanted Church of Scotland.

22. *At what period in her history did the Church of Scotland attain to the highest degree of reformation?*

During the brief but important period from 1638 to 1650.

23. *From what period may we trace the overthrow of the second or Covenanted Reformation?*

From the restoration of Charles II. to the British throne. No sooner was that perfidious monarch restored than he proceeded to the overthrow of the Covenanted Reformation—his oaths, declarations, and promises, being violated without scruple!

24. *What steps were taken by Charles II. and his counsellors to overthrow the Reformation in England?*

In this country, the hierarchy was restored without modification, and the Presbyterian ministers were expelled to make room for the grossly erroneous and immoral Episcopal clergy. The Act of Uniformity, by which 2,000 ministers were driven from their flocks in one day,

Note to question 23.—It must be acknowledged that even previous to the restoration of Charles II. several circumstances *tended* to the overthrow of the second Reformation—circumstances partly connected with the conduct of the Covenanters themselves and also with that of others. In entering upon a war with England in order to rescue Charles I. out of the hands of the sectaries, and in their proclaiming his son Charles II., while abundant evidence was not wanting of his hostility to the cause of Reformation, we discover an under attachment on the part of the Covenanters to the house of Stuart. The repeal of the Act of Classes—giving rise to the names of RESOLUTIONERS and PROTESTORS—and by which the known enemies of the Reformation were admitted to places of power and trust, prepared the way for the overthrow of the civil and religious liberty of the nation.—(See Act and Testimony, pp. 117—119.)

was passed; oaths and declarations requiring the renunciation of the Solemn League, were imposed; the Conventicle Act was framed (1664) by which all who attended the ministry of the banished ministers, were subjected to heavy penalties and to death itself; and by another Act the ministers themselves were forbidden to approach within five miles of any place where they had statedly exercised their ministry!

25. *What steps were taken to accomplish the same object in Scotland?*

Without attempting to present an outline of the series of iniquities therein established by law, two acts may be referred to. By the Act Recissory, all the meetings of Parliament held since 1640, were condemned as illegal, and their proceedings declared null and void! And by another Act, the Covenanted Reformation, and all done in its behalf from 1638 to 1650, were declared to be treasonable, and even to speak or write on behalf of the work of God, was pronounced treason!!

26. *Were the cruel and iniquitous acts, at this time passed, allowed to remain as a mere dead letter upon the statute-book?*

By no means. Not only were the Covenants burned, in the most public and ignominious manner, by the hands of the common executioner at London, Edinburgh, Linlithgow, and elsewhere, but a series of the most bloody

tragedies—surpassed in cruelty by none the Church ever experienced—were transacted for a period of 28 years, in the face of all Europe!

27. *What was the character of the sufferings to which the faithful Covenanters were exposed?*

The cruelties perpetrated on the martyrs of the Covenant were so extremely inhuman and brutish that a volume might fail to present a just idea of them! Multitudes were tortured and put to death in the most ruthless manner; hundreds were murdered in the open field without process of law; hundreds perished from cold, hunger, thirst, want of room and air in prisons, by fetters, whipping, tortures, &c.; thousands were banished to various parts of the world, and many sold as slaves; and by fines, oppressive exactions, burning and casting down houses, seizing goods, crop, cattle, &c., whole counties were left desolate! “Of fining and imprisoning there was scarcely any cessation, and the whole framework of government seemed converted into a vast court of inquisition.”

28. *Were the matters on account of which the Covenanters suffered and died of mere trivial importance?*

Note to question 27.—During the 21 years' persecution, above 18,000 suffered by death, slavery, exile, or imprisonment, in the wicked though vain endeavour, on the part of the ruling powers, to destroy the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and establish Prelacy on its ruins!—(See *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland*, pp. 290—294.)

Far from it. Their noble sufferings arose from a refusal to yield to the unqualified supremacy of the king over the Church and his absolute sovereignty over the nation—claims which embody the whole essence and impiety of Antichrist and swallow up the chief rights of God and man, and which placed at the disposal of an impious monarch, the property, liberty, and religion of an entire people!

29. *Who were the first that led up the van of the noble train of martyrs who suffered at this time for the truth?*

The first and among the most renowned of those who suffered under Charles II. were the Marquis of Argyle, who, ten years before, had placed the crown on the head of the king, and who was put to death May 27, 1661; the Rev. James Guthrie, who fell a few days after; and also the pious and learned Lord Warriston, who was put to death July 22, 1663, and who had been one of the Commissioners from the Church of Scotland to the Westminster Assembly.

30. *Is it not a mournful fact that during the persecution under the two royal brothers, various questions operated in such a way as to lead to serious divisions among the Presbyterians?*

Yes; among others may be mentioned the question of INDULGENCES, and that respecting the propriety of YIELDING ALLEGIANCE to the existing government.

31. *On what occasions were acts of indulgences proclaimed during the reign of Charles II.?*

In the years 1669, 1672, and 1679.

32. *What conditions were attached to these indulgences?*

The conditions attached to each were not precisely the same, but they all came through a polluted channel, and were fettered with conditions wholly inconsistent with ministerial freedom.

33. *What were some of these conditions?*

(1.) The Privy Council made choice of the individuals to be indulged, with their field of labour, removing them at pleasure. (2.) They were not allowed to preach beyond the limits of their own parishes, nor to travel out of them without a licence. (3.) They were commanded to hold their communion all on the same day, not to lecture, and not to admit into their pulpits any minister not indulged. (4.) They were required, in the king's name, to consti-

Note to question 33.—That the indulgences granted by Charles II. were Erastian and Popish is clear from the first act of the Parliament which legalized them, in which occur the words—"And that his Majesty and his successors may settle, enact, and emit such constitutions, acts, and orders concerning the administration of the external government of the Church, and the persons employed in the same, and concerning all ecclesiastical meetings, and matters to be proposed and determined therein, as they in their royal wisdom shall think fit."—(See Brown's History of the Indulgence, &c.)

tute Sessions and Presbyteries, all of which were held under the authority of the bishops; nor were any allowed to take cognizance of any case of discipline, all such cases being reserved for the bishop's courts. (See Testimony, p. 145.)

34. *Do we find the more faithful party at this time among the majority who accepted the royal indulgences, or among the minority who refused such compliances?*

Those who, rather than relinquish the claims of Immanuel to rule as King in his own house, were willing to forsake father and mother, house and lands, and all that flesh holds dear, and who on mountains and in glens maintained at the hazard of life, their ancient faith in its purity, were undoubtedly THE TRUE COVENANTED PRESBYTERIANS.

35. *When was it that the grave question respecting the propriety of yielding allegiance to the then existing government, began to be agitated among the suffering Presbyterians?*

About the time of the rising of Bothwell (1679), a number of the Covenanters, among whom Cameron, Douglas, and Cargill, took the

Note to question 34.—Of those denominated "Cameronians" or the true Covenanters, Hetherington observes that "their principles and proceedings bore a closer resemblance to those of the First and Second Reformations, than did the measures adopted by the greater number of the more compliant and larger party."—(See Hist. of Ch. of Scotland, p. 171.)

lead, became convinced that it was one of the sins of the nation to have done homage to the oppressor so long; they, therefore, after astonishing patience, renounced, in the most open and emphatic manner, their allegiance to a "throne of iniquity" which framed mischief by a law. (See Psalm xciv. 20.)

36. *Were the more faithful party justified in thus casting off their allegiance?*

Most clearly they were. The then reigning monarch (Charles II.) had violated his coronation oath; perjury, tyranny, blasphemy were inscribed on his diadem; and none but the most abject slaves of passive obedience could join in the shout of loyalty or bend the knee in token of reverence. The principles upon which those acted who cast off their allegiance to Charles, were held by Milton, Owen, Buchanan, Rutherford, and Knox; were embodied in the Solemn League and Covenant; and they were also avowed and acted upon by the nation at the Revolution in 1688.

37. *Did the Covenanters adopt any steps in vindication of the measures adopted by them at the period alluded to?*

Yes; they emitted joint declarations at Lanark, Rutherglen, and Sanquhar. In relation to these declarations, the Reformed Presbyterian Church asserts that "she would not be understood as espousing every sentiment or expression contained in them, but she re-

gards them as exhibiting a distinct and energetic view of the true grounds of the pending contest, as displaying hallowed zeal for God, surpassing love to His Church, and magnanimous contempt of danger. (Hist., Test. p. 151.)

38. *What was the effect of the open renunciation of allegiance on the part of the Covenanters?*

The persecution which followed was greatly increased in violence. None of the ministers who had been accustomed to preach in the fields could be induced to persevere in that service with the exception of the few who had cast off the tyrant's yoke, and these, one after another, sealed their testimony with their blood!

39. *What was the occasion of the origin of the Societies or Correspondencies established by the Covenanters?*

After the execution of Donald Cargill (July 27, 1681) the scattered but faithful remnant being left without teachers who might break to them the Bread of Life, met AT LOGAN HOUSE, in the parish of Lesmahagow, on December 15, 1681, and among other things formed themselves into the above associations.

40. *Who was the first minister whose labours the Society People enjoyed after the martyrdom of Cargill?*

During the period from 1681 till 1683, the Society People were without the voice of a

faithful pastor, but in the latter year the famous Mr. James Renwick, who had returned from Holland, whither he had gone to complete his education, received a call from the Societies to become their pastor, and by this godly and most zealous youth, the banner of the Covenant was raised aloft once more on the mountains and moors of Scotland.

41. Was Renwick left alone in his faithful labours?

For a considerable time this was the case, but he was at length joined by Mr. Alexander Shields, a licentiate; and also about the same time the Rev. Messrs. Thomas Linning and Wm. Boyd, both of whom had been educated abroad, made their accession to the Covenanters.

42. Were there any attempts made during the reign of James VII., to obtain a union between the "Covenanters" and the "Indulged" Presbyterians?

Yes; for this purpose several conferences were held between the persecuted followers of Renwick and the "Indulged," but the desired union was found impracticable. "The larger body had unquestionably yielded a sinful compliance with much that was directly subversive of Presbyterian principles; but their pride would not allow them to acknowledge their errors. On the other hand, the Society People or Cameronians, or more properly the strict Covenanters, would not consent to any union

without a previous acknowledgment from their brethren that they had indeed fallen into grievous and sinful defections." (See Hetherington Hist. &c., p. 170.)

43. *Were any Acts of Indulgences published during the reign of James VII.?*

Yes; three such Acts were proclaimed during the year 1687, and their design most clearly was to grant full toleration to the Papists, which could not be done without extending it also to the Presbyterians.

44. *Wherin do we discover the immoral character of the indulgences granted by James VII.?*

These indulgences all proceeded from an unscriptural, Erastian, and Popish source, being proclaimed "by his (the king's) sovereign authority, prerogative, royal, and absolute power, which all his subjects are to obey without reserve." They were all connected with the wicked restriction that nothing was to be preached or taught that might tend to alienate the people from the king's government, or in other words, that nothing should be spoken against Popery or arbitrary power!

45. *What were the effects of the indulgences granted by James?*

It is to be lamented that these bribes were generally accepted by the Presbyterian ministers, and that a large number of them concurred in sending up to the king a loyal ad-

dress, expressive of their gratitude for "his Majesty's gracious and surprising favour," and engaged that they would "preserve an entire loyalty in their doctrine and practice"! On the other hand, "the firm" unyielding Covenanters, rejected at once any and every indulgence or toleration of man's inalienable right to worship God according to the direction of his own revealed Word and will, and the dictates of an enlightened conscience. Alike defying the tyrant's threats and spurning his favours, they resolved to hold on their unswerving course, to continue their field-preachings, and to oppose the exercise of arbitrary power on the one hand, and a course of weak and sinful submission on the other." (Heth. Hist. p. 171.)

46. *Who was the last martyr who suffered death in behalf of the cause of the Covenanted Reformation?*

The Rev. James Renwick, who having witnessed a good confession, suffered martyrdom on the 17th of Feb., 1688, aged 26 years.

47. *What remarkable event occurred in the year of Renwick's martyrdom, 1688?*

The famous Revolution in which the Popish monarch James was driven from the British throne, and a Protestant monarch assumed the reigns of power.

48. *Did not the noble struggles of the persecuted Covenanters tend, in a very material man-*

ner, to the accomplishment of the Revolution of 1688 ?

Yes, very materially. "Their standard on the mountains of Scotland indicated to the vigilant eye of William that the nation was ripening for a change"; and when the Prince of Orange issued his manifesto, although its circulation was prohibited, the Covenanters assisted greatly in spreading it throughout the length and breadth of the land. Moreover, on the rumour of an Irish invasion, the Covenanters armed in defence of their country, and when the Scottish Convention was overawed by the ferocious Claverhouse, these bold defenders of their country, being specially requested, came armed to Edinburgh, to resist every outrage. Again, in a petition to the same convention, the Covenanters petitioned that the Crown should be bestowed upon William, and on proper conditions, proffered to him their allegiance. And in fine, when a civil war was excited by the adherents of James, the country was effectually succoured by a regiment of "Cameronians," raised in one day, without beat of drum or the expenditure of levy-money! (See Hether. Hist. pp. 173—177.)

49. Why did the Covenanters refuse ultimately to fall in with the conditions of the Revolution settlement ?

The Covenanters, who were then a small minority in Scotland with a few Presbyterians

in the North of Ireland, were compelled to decline the fellowship of the Revolution *Church* and also to protest against the *State*, because in the Revolution settlement the attainments of the second Reformation were almost wholly overlooked, and constitutions subversive of those they were sworn to preserve, were set up. The Covenanters were accustomed to speak of the Revolution settlement as the grave-stone placed upon the work of the second Reformation!

50. *Has experience confirmed the correctness of the estimate taken, by the Covenanters, of the Revolution settlement?*

Yes; in the recent conflicts with the Law Courts, of those who now constitute the Free Church of Scotland, we have a remarkable illustration of the correctness of the view taken by our fathers in respect to the Revolution settlement: for, while in those noble struggles the Seceders from the Revolution Established Church of Scotland, were Scripturally right, they were legally and constitutionally wrong.

51. *What important event took place in the year after the martyrdom of Renwick?*

The British Covenants were renewed (March 3, 1689) at Borland Hill, in Lesmahagow, on which occasion the assemblage was very large, the Rev. Messrs. Shields, Linning, and Boyd, presided, and a revival of religion seems to have been experienced.

52. *Was the comparative prosperity enjoyed by the Church in connexion with this act of Covenant renovation, of long continuance?*

Alas! no. The faith of the Church was severely tried, soon after this act of renovation, by the defection of Linning, Boyd, and Shields, to the Revolution Church, and the "Society People" were left without a minister for a period of sixteen years.

53. *How did the "Societies" conduct themselves during this long interval?*

They continued to act in their former capacity until their prayers for a faithful minister were answered by the accession to their cause, in the year 1706, of the Rev. John M'Millan, from the Established or Revolution Church.

54. *What other minister made accession to the "Societies," soon after Mr. M'Millan?*

Mr. John M'Neill, a licentiate, and although never ordained, he laboured faithfully as a preacher till his death, Dec. 10, 1732.

55. *When and by whom was the Auchensaugh Renovation conducted?*

The renovation of the Covenants at Auchensaugh, near Douglas, took place in 1712, and the ministers by whom it was conducted were the Rev. John M'Millan, and Mr. John M'Neill. This renovation was entered into with a view to the fresh instances of the nation's apostacy presented by the Incorporating Union with

England, in 1707, and the restoration of patronage in 1711, and also as a means of confirming the faith of the Church, and of giving a public testimony for the cause of Scotland's reformation.

56. *What renders the year 1743 an important era in the history of the Covenanting Church?*

On the first day of August, in that year, at Braehead, in the parish of Carnwath, the Rev. Messrs. McMillan and Nairn (from the Secession Church), with a few ruling elders, constituted themselves into a Church Court, under the name of the REFORMED PRESBYTERY, from which appellation the *Reformed Presbyterian* or *Covenanting Church*, has since been known.

57. *Do Covenanters attach much importance to the appellation "Reformed Presbyterian," as applied to their Church?*

I think not. Covenanters believe that the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch (Acts xi. 26), and they would greatly rejoice if this original designation would suffice universally at the present day. At the same time they believe that as the designation *Protestant* became necessary from the Antichristian assumptions of Popery, and that of *Presbyterian* partly from the haughty pretensions of prelacy, so, in like manner, the epithet REFORMED was rightly assumed by our fathers, not as a haughty assumption of mere superiority, but

as expressive of attachment to the whole of the Scriptural attainments of the second reformation.

58. *Did not the Reformed Presbytery, soon after its constitution, proceed to an Act of Covenant Renovation?*

Yes; in the year 1745, two years after the formation of the Presbytery, the Covenants were, once more, renewed at Crawfordjohn, in Lanarkshire.

59. *What two events, in connexion with the Reformed Presbyterian Church, distinguished the year 1761?*

In that year, the "Act, Declaration, and Testimony" of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was emitted, and in the same year, the Church in IRELAND first received the benefit of a settled ministry.

60. *Had any ministers of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, preached in Ireland, previous to 1761?*

Yes; Rev. Messrs. Alex. Marshall and Mr. Main had been ordained and sent to Ireland to confirm the brethren there; and Mr. M'Millan, himself, had, at least on one occasion, preached in the neighbourhood of Ballymena,

61. *How was the cause of the Covenanted*

Note to question 59.—The historical part of the testimony was drawn up by the Rev. John Courtass, and the doctrinal part by the Rev. John Thorburn.

Reformation preserved in Ireland before the Church in that country enjoyed the benefit of a settled ministry?

From 1688 till 1761, the Church in Ireland, as their brethren in Scotland had done, maintained Christian fellowship, by means of religious societies or prayer meetings.

62. *Were not these societies visited, on several occasions, by ministers and licentiates from Scotland?*

Yes; so early as 1670, and on various occasions till the close of his eventful life, the celebrated Alexander Peden, visited and watered the scattered adherents of the Covenanted Reformation in Ireland; and after the Revolution, when Shields, Linning, and Boyd, had forsaken their testimony, the Rev. David Houston, returned from Scotland, and laboured among the societies, till his death, in 1699. At a subsequent period, Mr. Thomas Cuthbertson, and Mr. John Cameron, were sent over from Scotland to confirm the brethren; and shortly afterwards, Mr. William Martin was settled for some time at Kellswater. Aided by ministers from Scotland, Mr. Martin dispensed the Lord's Supper at Donegore, and also at a place near Derry, &c.

63. *Who was the first minister permanently ordained over a regularly organized congregation in Ireland?*

The Rev. Matthew Linn or Lynd, who was ordained on the 21st August, 1761, as stated pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian congregation at Vow, near Rasharkin. In 1765, two other ministers were ordained in Ireland, Messrs. Wm. James, at Bready, and Daniel N. McClelland, at Laymore, near Ballymena; so that the Church in Ireland was soon rendered independent of the ministrations of the Scottish brethren.

64. *When was the first Presbytery constituted in Ireland?*

Until 1792, the Covenanting ministers in Ireland acted in the capacity of a committee of the "Scottish Presbytery," but in that year the committee constituted themselves into a Presbyterian capacity, on the footing of the Covenanted Testimony of the Church of Scotland. The FIRST PRESBYTERY in Ireland consisted of five or six ministers.

65. *At what period was the Reformed Presbyterian Church organized in North America?*

During the persecutions in Scotland many Presbyterians who had been compelled to flee their native land, found an asylum in America. These exiles and their descendants formed themselves into praying societies, when such was practicable; and in 1743, they held a meeting at which the Covenants were renewed. Being deserted by Mr. Craighead, whose labours they had enjoyed for some time,

the united societies in that country, after being six years without a pastor, importuned the Scottish Presbytery for aid. In accordance with their urgent request, Presbytery sent to the societies in America, in 1752, the Rev. Thomas Cuthbertson, who, for a period of twenty years, was the only minister who displayed a banner for the whole of the Covenanted Reformation, on the American Continent.

66. *In what year was the first Presbytery constituted in America?*

In 1774; and this first Presbytery consisted of Rev. Messrs. Cuthbertson, Linn, and Dobbin, with ruling elders. The Rev. Messrs. Linn and Dobbin, were from the Church in Ireland.

67. *What renders the year 1811, memorable in the annals of the Reformed Presbyterian Church?*

In this year THREE GENERAL SYNODS were constituted in the three sister Churches of Scotland, Ireland, and America—all adhering to the same Scriptural testimony! The first meeting of "The Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland" was held at Cullybacky, near Ballymena, on the 1st of May, 1811.

68. *From the past history and present position of these Churches, have we not much reason for thankfulness to the Most High?*

Most certainly. Amidst much privation,

various changes, and many difficulties, the good hand of God has been with them hitherto, and the labours of a faithful ministry in America, Scotland, and Ireland, have been blessed with a steady and encouraging increase of the membership of the respective Churches. "The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad; turn again our captivity, O Lord, as the streams in the South." (Psalm cxxvi. 3—4.)

69. *What is the present position of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland?*

She consists of six Presbyteries, has thirty-four ordained ministers, and an encouraging number of licentiates and young men attending the Theological Hall and the different universities. She has also a number of missionaries—one among the Jews in London, one among the natives of New Zealand, and one in the New Hebrides.

70. *What is the present position of the Church in America?*

It is painful to be under the necessity of stating that, in 1833, a division took place in the American Church, chiefly with respect to the propriety of owning the United States Constitution. "The Reformed Presbyterian Synod of North America," or those who adhere faithfully to the principles of the Covenanted Reformation, consists of five Presbyteries, composed in all of between fifty and sixty minis-

ters. There is also a Theological Seminary and Home Mission Scheme, under the superintendence of Synod.

71. What is the present position of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Ireland?

In connexion with the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Ireland there are *thirty-eight* congregations and missionary stations, *four* Presbyteries, and *twenty-six* ordained ministers, including an Irish missionary, and *four* missionaries in the British North American colonies.

72. As regards the Church in Ireland, what particular occurrence distinguishes the year 1853?

At a special meeting of Synod, held in October of that year, at Dervock, near Ballymoney, the British Covenants were solemnly renewed in a Bond, adapted to the present times. *Seventeen* ministers, *two* licentiates, and *thirty-four* elders appended their names to the Act of Covenant Renovation. The example set by Synod, in 1853, has since been followed by a large majority of the congregations of the Church.

Note to question 71.—The lover of Zion's peace and unity cannot but regret the melancholy division which took place in the Irish Synod, in 1840, when, as the ultimate crisis of a protracted controversy on the question of the magistrates power *circa sacra*, five ministers, five elders, and eight commissioners, laid on Synod's table a Declinature, and withdrew from under the jurisdiction of Synod. The "Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Synod" consists of two Presbyteries, nine congregations, and five ministers.

73. *What schemes, worthy of particular observation, have recently been proposed and partly carried out by the Irish Synod?*

In 1854, a Divinity Hall, for the training of Theological students, was established, to be conducted by two professors—one for Systematic, and the other for Exegetical and Pastoral Theology; a plan for the better support of the Gospel Ministry, has been introduced; a mission to Australia has been proposed, and is still in contemplation; and a mission to the Native Irish has been actually established.

Note to question 73.—The first missionary to Australia, from the Church in Ireland, was ordained August 18, 1857.

CHAPTER III.

DOCTRINES PROFESSED BY THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

74. *Is it merely by an historical retrospect that you trace a connexion between the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the Church of the Second Reformation?*

This connexion may also be discovered by a comparison of the doctrines believed, the practice inculcated, and the relations sustained by the Reformed Presbyterian Church, with those of the Church of the Second Reformation.

75. *What are the doctrines embraced in the Church's creed?*

It is evident that it would be quite impracticable even to name individually, all the doctrines embraced in the Church's creed; hence, in order to give a distinct reply to this question, it will be necessary to have recourse to classification, and thus present the doctrines in one view.

76. *What mode of classification shall you adopt?*

I shall adopt that mode of classification which seems the most accurate, comprehensive, and Scriptural; that is, I shall show that the doctrines held by the Reformed Presbyterian Church are *Scriptural, Evangelical, Protestant, Presbyterian, Covenanting*, and that they *have a regard to man in his civil relations*.

77. *By this mode of classification, do you intend that each of the doctrines held by the Reformed Presbyterian Church, are possessed of the above six distinct qualities?*

No, I do not. I intend that, while ALL the doctrines of the Church may, in common, be placed under the *first category* (i.e. that they are all SCRIPTURAL) they may also all be subdivided and placed under their respective divisions of Evangelical, Protestant, Presbyterian, Covenanting, and having a regard to man in his civil relations.

78. *Why do you not follow the mode of classification suggested by the words PARTICULAR OR DISTINGUISHING, as applied to some of the doctrines of the Church?*

Because such a mode of classification is vague and unsatisfactory, and even, in some measure, unscriptural.

79. *How can this be shown?*

The *particular or distinguishing* principles of the Covenanted Reformation are not so denominated from anything in themselves *but from the fact that others oppose or neglect them*; but

the errors of men are numerous and various ; and hence it follows that a mode of classification suggested by any one class of errors, will leave a high degree of vagueness as regards the Church's testimony in connexion with other classes of errors, &c.

80. *You consider, then, that the proper way is to follow a mode of classification which, while it presents the truth in its positive aspect, as laid down in the Bible, at the same time furnishes a basis on which to erect the testimony of the Church, as opposed to every species of error?*

I do. While present, outstanding, and prevailing errors are to be made the special objects of the Church's testimony, the whole truth is also, as Providence gives a particular call, to be employed in the way of testimony, against every opposing error.

SECTION I.

DOCTRINES OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—SCRIPTURAL.

81. *What is the supreme and all authoratative standard of Doctrine and Practice professed by the Covenanting Church?*

The WORD OF GOD ; "to the law and to the testimony ; if they speak not according to this

word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. viii. 20).

82. *Is not what the immortal Chillingworth said of the religion of Protestants generally, emphatically true of the religion of Covenanters, that "the Bible, the Bible only is the religion of Protestants?"*

Yes; "Not the tradition of men; not the authority of Pope, Prelate, or Prince; not supposed agreeableness to reason and the fitness of things; not venerable antiquity; not fascinating novelty; not present expediency; not even the authority of the Church, but the revealed will of Christ is the immediate authoritative and ultimate reason of the Church's faith and ordinances."*

83. *The Word of God being alone acknowledged as SUPREME, in what sense are the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, larger and shorter, &c., said to be standards of the Church?*

Only in a *subordinate* sense—the Bible is held, in all things, to be absolutely supreme.

84. *Can an intelligent member of the Church attempt to prove any doctrine, as true or false, on the authority of the subordinate standards?*

No; subordinate standards, being simply a united declaration by the Church of what is believed to be the mind of God revealed in the

Scriptures, while they subserve many valuable purposes, cannot be appealed to as ultimate and authoritative proof.

85. *What is the language of the "Confession of Faith," on this subject.*

It is as follows: "the Supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture."*

SECTION II.

DOCTRINES OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—EVANGELICAL.

86. *What is the import of the word Evangelical?*

"Evangel" was the word used at the time of the Reformation for "Gospel," and was from the Latin *Evangelium*, which latter term was the word employed as the translation of a Greek word, which means "good news." Hence evangelical truth simply intends

* Confession of Faith, Chap. I.

“Gospel” truth—the truth which makes known the way of man’s recovery from the ruins of the fall.

87. *Are not the truths set forth by this precious word, all-important and glorious?*

Most certainly; although all truth is important, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the Church are all to be loved and contended for; at the same time, it is undoubtedly true, that the most glorious truth—the most faithful saying—ever uttered to a guilty world, is that announced by the Apostle, when he exclaims “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.” (1 Tim. i. 15).

88. *Wherein do we discover the great importance of the evangelical doctrines?*

The great truths connected with man’s fall (Gen. iii. 1; Cor. xv. 21, 22); the person of the Saviour; his love, labours, sorrows, and death; the saving and sanctifying power of the Redeemer’s blood as applied to the guilty soul by the Divine Spirit (1 Tim. iii. 16; John xvii. 23; xvii. 4; Matt. xvii. 1—16; 1 John i. 7); the unspeakable freeness of the everlasting Gospel, and all the Divine graces that flow from a living union to the one living head (Isaiah lv. 1—3; Gal. v. 22—24); these doctrines are not only infinitely important in themselves, but they also serve as a *vinculum* to

bind together in love all evangelical Christians throughout the whole world, although found in connexion with various ecclesiastical denominations. (John xvii. 21).

89. *Did not the evangelical doctrines, and especially that of justification by faith, lie at the foundation of the Protestant Reformation throughout Europe?*

Yes; the power and might of that great religious revival, consisted, under God, in its re-exhibition of the saving doctrines of the Gospel, and especially that of "justification by faith," which has been well designated by Luther—"articulus standis vel cadentis ecclesiæ"—*the test of a standing or a falling Church.*

90. *Had the Reformers of the Second Reformation an equal regard to the doctrines of grace?*

Yes; it seems to be undeniably true, that no religious revival recorded in history, presents us with a greater fulness of Gospel truth than the Second or Covenanted Reformation.

91. *How does this appear?*

It is manifest from the fervent personal piety, of the great majority of those who were instrumental in achieving the work of the Second Reformation, and also from the doctrinal symbols of that Reformation, wherein there is a very clear exhibition of the doctrines of grace and salvation. (See Conf. of Faith, Chapter on Justification; Larger Catechism, Ques. 70—73; Shorter Cat., Ques. 33, &c.)

92. *Is it true, then, that the 'heroes of the Martyr Church of Scotland, who, in the times of persecution, embarked their all in the cause they had espoused, suffered and died for mere transcendentalisms—truths of no practical value?*

None can say so who are at all acquainted with their doctrines and habits; for, while in their testimony they embraced a very extensive range of truth, it was the "blessed evangel" that led them forth to the mountains and moors of their native land, at the hazard of losing all things, even life itself.

93. *Is it not highly probable that, in later times, the labours of Reformed Presbyterian ministers in Scotland have been blessed as a means of displaying a banner for truth, as regards other religious bodies?*

Yes; it is highly probable. For above a century, the full and faithful displays of the Gospel made from place to place and time to time, by Covenanting ministers in Scotland, have been instrumental, we have no doubt, in the hand of the Divine Spirit, in preserving a love for evangelical religion in that country: nay, it might, perhaps, be shown that those labours may have had no unimportant relation to the recent secession of the Free Church.

94. *Is there reason to believe that the labours of Covenanting ministers in Ulster have, during the last fifty years, been productive of similar beneficial results?*

With regard to the North of Ireland, there is little doubt but that the Reformation effected in the Synod of Ulster when Arianism was cast out, and a higher tone of feeling manifested in regard to the Westminster Confession of Faith, was, at least in part, promoted by the doctrines and practices of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. One thing is quite manifest: that measures of reformation recently attained to in other Presbyterian bodies, both in Scotland and in the North of Ireland, have been approximations to the status occupied by the Reformed Church. "Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?"

SECTION III.

DOCTRINES OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—PROTESTANT.

95. *What is the origin of the word Protestant?*

The word had its origin in consequence of a PROTEST entered by the German Reformers against a decree of the Diet of the Empire, held in 1529, at Spire, prohibiting the people from abolishing the mass, or making any innovations in religion.* A Protestant, therefore, is one who protests against the errors of Popery.

* See Robertson's History of Charles V., vol. ii., pp. 87, 88.

96. *What are the names of the chief Protestant Reformers of Europe?*

The names of the chief Protestant Reformers in Europe are, John Wickliff, in England; Luther and Melancthon, in Germany; Calvin, in France and Geneva; John Huss and Jerome of Prague, in Bohemia; Zuingli, Oecolampadius, and Farel, of Switzerland; and John Knox, of Scotland.

97. *What is that era, in the history of the Church of Scotland, between the years 1560 and 1592, usually called?*

The era of the FIRST REFORMATION. In the former year (1560) the authority of the Roman Pontiff was renounced, and a Confession of Faith and a Book of Discipline drawn up and adopted; and in the latter year (1592), an Act was passed, sometimes called THE GREAT CHARTER OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, by which the General Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, and Sessions of the Church were ratified, in opposition to all Statutes, Acts, and Laws—civil, canon, or municipal—made to the contrary.*

Note to question 97.—That part of the Act of Parliament of 1592, which formally abolished Popery, is very expressive, and it is to be hoped that its truth shall be verified in all time coming:—"Quhilk (one of the old laws establishing Popery) his Majesty and Estatis foresaids declaris to be expyrit in the self, and to be null in tyme cuming, and of nane avail, force, nor effect."

* See Calderwood, Spotswood, and Hetherington, pp. 53, 54.

98. *What was the era of the Second Reformation in Scotland?*

The period from 1638 to 1649, inclusive.

99. *What was the occasion of the Second Reformation?*

For a period of 40 years, previous to 1638, it was manifestly the design of the ruling powers, in Church and State, to assimilate the Church of Scotland to that of England, and both to that of Rome. An endless variety of despotic courses were adopted to crush the spirit of the people; but the crisis was produced by the iniquitous attempt of Charles I. and his minions to force upon the Church of Scotland a Liturgy and a Book of Ecclesiastical Canons—the former of which bore a nearer resemblance to the Romish Breviary than even the Church of England Prayer Book, and by the latter the whole ecclesiastical polity of the Scottish Church was overturned!

100. *Can you present an outline of the various steps of reformation effected between the years 1638 and 1649?*

Yes; the Presbyterian form of Church government was restored in its purity; and in addition to various other important acts, the Five Articles of Perth were repealed; * and the

* The Five Articles of Perth are, Kneeling at the Sacrament; the Private Administration of Baptism; Private Communicating; the Observation of Holidays; and Confirmation.

Service Book, Book of Canons, Book of Ordination, the civil places and power of Churchmen, the High Commission Court, and Episcopacy itself, as opposed to the Bible and abjured by the Covenant, together with the corrupt Assemblies by which they had been sanctioned, were all condemned and swept away!

101. *Do you consider the First or Second Reformation the more thoroughly Protestant?*

The Second Reformation was the more thoroughly Protestant, inasmuch as it swept away in a most effectual manner, not only the marked abominations of Popery, but also the more insidious corruptions of *Popish Prelacy*, which for a period of 40 years had produced such bitter fruits in the Church of Scotland.

102. *Is it not common to hear persons, while speaking of the various denominations in these lands, designating the Church of England as*

Note to question 100.—The foundation of all the future attainments in connexion with the Second Reformation, was laid in the famous Glasgow Assembly of 1638. This Assembly met on the 21st of November of that year, and Alexander Henderson, the Knox of the Second Reformation, was elected moderator. Notwithstanding great opposition, on the part of the Royal Commissioner, the Assembly proceeded with their labours till a Reformation was accomplished more perfect than any of which we read in ecclesiastical history.

Note to question 101.—The First Reformation was by no means perfect. In relation to some of its defects, see Act and Testimony, pp. 66, 67—Historical Part.

the Protestant Church, in contrast to others usually designated Dissenters?

Yes, and with great impropriety, inasmuch as the Church of England is, perhaps, the least Protestant of all the evangelical denominations! With regard to her government, the Popish hierarchy is almost wholly retained. In the services for the visitation of the sick and the burial of the dead, the leaven of Popish error abundantly manifests itself. And above all, the practical working of the system, both in former and present times, confirms the shrewd observation of Milton, that "Prelacy has always been the stirrup by which Anti-christ has vaulted into the saddle."

103. *Wherein do we discover the Protestantism of the Reformed Presbyterian Church?*

In her doctrinal symbols, and in her ecclesiastical status or position.

104. *Are the doctrinal standards of the Reformed Presbyterian Church Protestant in their character?*

Yes, in an eminent degree. The National Covenant of Scotland contains the most succinct and complete condemnation of Popery contained in any language; the "extirpation" of Popery, &c., forms part of one of the articles of the Solemn League; the Confession of Faith and Catechisms tacitly condemn all the errors of Popery; and in various statements of the Confession," Popery is expressly denounced;

and it is only necessary to refer to the "Testimony" of the Church, to convince the inquirer that it too is framed with a view to the unconditional condemnation of the Roman Antichrist.

105. *How is the Protestantism of the Reformed Presbyterian Church discoverable from her position?*

The position assumed by the Reformed Presbyterian Church manifests a more thoroughly Protestant spirit than that evinced by any other of the British Churches. This is evident from her adherence to the whole attainments of the Second Reformation, in Church and State, and also from her refusal to acknowledge, as the moral ordinance of God, the British constitution, which supports and countenances, in such an emphatic manner, the great Antichristian Apostacy.

106. *Do you consider that the position assumed by the Reformed Presbyterian Church is capable of ample vindication both from the Word of God, and also from the present position of affairs, civil and ecclesiastic?*

Most certainly. This is treated of in another chapter; but it may be here remarked, that if Britain is to be saved at all from the dread vortex of Popish ascendancy, it must be by a *Protestantism* of a sterner and more Scriptural character than much of that which now assumes the name. In order to this, so desirable a

consummation, the Evangelical Churches must not only proclaim the whole truth, but also assume a position of firm, Scriptural, practical protest against "the throne of iniquity, which frameth mischief by a law." (Ps. xciv. 20.)

SECTION IV.

DOCTRINES OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—PRESBYTERIAN.

107. *What is the origin of the word Presbyterian?*

Presbyter is a term of official authority, applied, in the New Testament, to the teaching and ruling elder; and *Presbytery* is used (see 1 Tim. iv. 14) to denote an assembly of Presbyters; hence, the word *Presbyterian* has been very commonly used to designate the government of the Church, according to that model which all true Presbyterians acknowledge to be of Divine right and original.

108. *What is the history of Presbyterianism?*

The history of Presbyterianism leads us back into a deep antiquity. "Elders"—men of wisdom and experience—existed among the Covenant people of God, while yet in a state of bondage in Egypt (see Exod. iii. 16), previous

to the establishment of the ceremonial economy. Moses chose "wise" and "able men" out of the tribes of Israel, and made them rulers over *thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens* (Exod. xviii. 25, 26) and those rulers; are almost always in the Old Testament styled "elders"; and under the Old Testament economy, the essential principles of Presbyterianism were established.*

109. *Do we not find the Presbyterian form of Church government established under the Apostles, and adopted during the first two centuries of the Christian Church?*

Yes; during the ministry of the Apostles, the model of the Synagogue was universally adopted as the basis of the Christian Church (Luke iv. 16—21; Mark, i. 21; Jas. ii. 2), and during the first two centuries of the Christian Church the plan of ecclesiastical government was evidently Presbyterian, as may be learned from the Epistles of Ignatius, the writings of Clemens Romanus, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, &c.†

110. *Have we any example of the existence of a Presbyterian Church during the darkest period of the reign of Antichrist?*

Yes; the Paulicians, in the 7th century, were Presbyterians; and afterwards, the Wal-

* See McLeod's Catechism, pp. 27, 28. † See Miller's Presbyterianism the Primitive Constitution of the Church, p. 12.

denses and Albigenses protested most zealously—even *Bellarmino* being witness—against the encroachments of Prelacy; and *Aeneas Sylvius*, afterwards Pope Pius II., declares that “they, the Waldenses, deny the *hierarchy*, maintaining that there is no difference among the priests, by reason of dignity or office.” *

111. *Did the Churches of the Reformation generally adopt the Presbyterian form of Church government?*

Yes; it is most pleasing to observe the unanimity existing among the leaders in that glorious enterprise, with regard to Presbyterian principles. Almost all the Reformers maintained that, in the Apostolic age, there was no Prelacy, and that the government of the Church by ruling, as well as teaching elders, was warranted in Scripture; and all the Reformed Churches of France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, Geneva, and Scotland, were thoroughly Presbyterian in principle and practice. The Church of England was the only one, in all Protestant Christendom, which, at the Reformation, adopted the system of Prelacy!

112. *Was the Church of the Second Reformation Presbyterian?*

Yes; the Church of Scotland, since her first organization, has always been essentially Presbyterian. The Church of the First Reformation was Presbyterian, although all the parts

* See Miller, p. 16.

of the system were not then fully developed. In the Second Reformation, however, as may be learned from the Second Book of Discipline, and from "the Form of Presbyterial Church Government," drawn up by the Westminster Divines, we discover a very Scriptural model of *Presbyterianism*, which form of Church government the Reformed Presbyterian Church has always maintained to be of Divine right and original.

113. *What particular subjects do you comprehend under the word Presbyterian, as used in this section?*

Although this word, properly speaking, denotes simply the form of Church government, in the present section I understand the word as embracing the following subjects, namely: *the Doctrines, the Head, the Officers, the Courts, the Worship, and the Discipline*, of the Presbyterian Church.

114. *What are the doctrines of the Reformed Presbyterian Church?*

These have been formerly shown to be *Scriptural, Evangelical, and Protestant*; and it may now be further stated that these doctrines are the *Trinitarian, Calvinistic, Orthodox* "doctrines of the Reformation," as laid down in the Confession of Faith, and substantially espoused by the great body of the Reformers.

115. *Who is the HEAD of the Church?*

The Lord Jesus Christ. (Isa. ix. 6,7; Matt. xxiii. 8—10; John xiii. 13; Col. i. 18.)

116. *In what respects is Christ the Head of the Church?*

There are *five* distinct senses in which Christ may be taken as the Head of the Church:—1. As head of *existence* to the Church. 2. As *legislative* head. 3. As head of *wisdom* and *gracious vital influences*. 4. As *executive* head. 5. As *protecting* head.

117. *How is Christ head of existence to the Church?*

He is so, inasmuch as the Church owes its existence to Christ. The Church is not a mere voluntary association, nor can it be created by Act of Parliament; but whether we view the Church *locally*, as the Church of a particular place, or the *whole* Church as such, it is the handy-work of the Great Master Builder, Jesus Christ, who by means of the Gospel and the Holy Spirit, takes one of a city and two of a family, and brings them to Zion. (Psalm cli. 16; cxlvii. 2—4; Matt. xxviii. 18—20; Acts xv. 14; Heb. iii. 1—3; Jer. iii. 14.)

118. *How is Christ legislative Head of His Church?*

He is so as He is the head of all authority legislative in the Church. All her laws and ordinances are of Christ's appointment. The ordinances of the Mosaic economy were prescribed by the Redeemer (Acts vii. 38); and when these had served their object, the same

power which instituted those ancient rites, abolished them, and, in their stead, appointed the precious ordinances of the New Testament. (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.)

119. *How may the honours of Christ's headship, in this respect, be derogated from?*

In two ways: *first*, by instituting laws or ordinances in addition to those appointed by the Great Lawgiver; and, *secondly*, by repealing or setting aside those laws or institutions which Christ has appointed.

120. *Have not the churches of Rome and England invaded the rights of Christ's headship, in both the above-mentioned ways?*

Yes; the Church of Rome by instituting new laws, or by setting aside the institutions of the Saviour, has virtually repealed the whole code of New Testament laws with regard to the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the Church; and the Church of England has, in the most unwarrantable manner, prescribed holidays, introduced the rite of confirmation, and required the sign of the cross, and godfathers and godmothers in connexion with baptism, &c.

121. *What do you intend when you say that Christ is head of wisdom and gracious vital influences to the Church?*

That Christ, having founded the Church, and given her a perfect code of laws, is, in addition, the source of all saving knowledge

and gracious sanctifying influences, as regards the whole Church and the individual believer. (Heb. i. 1, 2; Col. ii. 3; Matt. xi. 27.)

122. *How does Christ communicate all required knowledge, and convey all gracious influences to the Church?*

As the Great Prophet of God, He speaks to us in the Scriptures, and the dispensation of the Spirit by which ordinances are made effectual to salvation, and the grace which the Church needs imparted, are exclusively in His hands. (John v. 39; 2 Tim. iii. 15—17; Col. ii. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 6; John xvi. 7—14; Rev. iii. 1.)

123. *Who are they who infringe on Christ's headship in this respect?*

All do so who are not satisfied with the Word of God as the alone rule of faith and manners. The Church of Rome does so by resting upon mere tradition; the interpretations of Scripture as given by the Church; by making the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and the Catechism of the Council of Trent, supreme standards of faith; and by claiming for the Church a deposit of gracious influences to be dispensed by her ministers to those who seek it after a prescribed form. Tractarians imitate the Church of Rome in the above respects; and while the Episcopal Church requires the Apocrypha to be read "for example of life and instruction of manners," the Irvingites and others go so

far as to include the pretended prophesyings of their religious teachers!

124. *What do you understand by Christ being executive Head of His Church?*

I intend that the worship and discipline of the Church are to be conducted and carried out, not in the name or by the authority of Pope, Prelate, or Potentate, but in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ. (1 Cor. v. 4.)

125. *Do not the Established Churches of England and Scotland derogate from the honours of Christ as executive head of His Church, by submitting to Erastian State control?*

Yes; the 37th Article of the Church of England runs thus:—"The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions; under whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, *whether they be ecclesiastical or civil*, IN ALL CAUSES doth appertain." And as regards the Scottish Establishment, the Act 1592, which the Act 1690 revived and confirmed as the Great Charter of the establishment, contains no acknowledgment of the headship of Christ! Moreover, the restoration of patronage after it had been repeatedly abolished, and the repeated prorogation and dissolution of her assemblies by the Sovereign (as in 1691 and '95); together with the recent secession of the Free Church, and the abject acquiescence of the Residuary As-

sembly, with the Erastian decisions of the civil power, abundantly prove that Church to be the veriest slave of Erastian State control.

126. *Was not the Church of the Second Reformation an Anti-Erastian as well as an Anti-popish and Anti-prelatic Church?*

Yes, eminently so. The famous Assembly of 1638 describe the difference between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction thus:—"As to the persons, manner of government, matters treated, and form of proceeding, all is ecclesiastical, and only ecclesiastical, in the one; and all civil, and only civil, in the other. Their very principles and rules are different. In the one, civil laws are the rule; but, in the other, the Word of God is the only rule. They are independent of one another in their own jurisdiction; and, as an Assembly cannot prescribe rules to the Parliament in civil matters, no more ought the Parliament to prescribe to the Assembly in ecclesiastical."*

127. *Has the Reformed Presbyterian Church always manifested a firm and resolute opposition to the encroachments of Erastianism?*

Yes; since the period when Renwick and Shields emitted the "*informatory vindication of a poor, wasted, misrepresented remnant of the suffering Anti-popish, Anti-prelatic, Anti-erastian, Anti-sectarian, true Presbyterian Church of Christ in Scotland*," till the present time, Erastianism has always been one of the chief of those errors which the Reformed Presby-

* Stevenson's History, pp. 303, 304.

terian Church has protested against as alike opposed to the honours of the Redeemer's crown, the liberties of the Church, and the rights of man. In fact, one ground of the distinct standing of the Covenanting Church is that she might, with unshackled hands, lift up a stern practical protest against the Erastianism lodged by the British constitution in the British crown.

128. *Is not Christ also the protecting and everlasting Head of His Church?*

Most assuredly. Christ is known in the palaces of Zion for a refuge. Having founded the Church on a rock, He still defends, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her; and having an unchangeable priesthood, He is able to save to the uttermost those who come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them. (Psalm xlviii. 3; Matt. xvi. 18; Heb. vii. 24, 25.)

129. *What are the OFFICERS whom Christ has appointed in the Christian Church?*

In the primitive Church a number of *extraordinary* officers were appointed as apostles, evangelists, prophets, and interpreters of tongues (Ephes. iv. 10—13); but the *ordinary* and *permanent* officers in the Church are of two kinds, namely, elders and deacons. (Acts xiv. 21—23; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8; 1 Pet. v. 1.)

130. *Do we find in Scripture any distinction made in the class of Church officers denominated presbyters or elders?*

Yes ; in every Church we read of a plurality of elders—the elder labouring in “word and doctrine,” as well as in the oversight of the flock, and those elders who only rule. (Acts xiv. 23 ; Titus i. 5 ; 1 Tim. v. 17 ; Rom. xii. 8.)

131. *What are some of the names given in Scripture to the teaching elder?*

Besides pastor and elder, he is also called bishop, teacher, and angel of the Church—all which designations are descriptive of the various duties connected with the same office. (Acts xx. 28 ; 1 Cor. xii. 28 ; Rev. ii. 1.)

132. *Is there any example of Diocesan Prelacy in the New Testament?*

Not one. Although there are two texts in which the translators of the English Bible have substituted the meaning of the word *bishop* for the word itself (see Acts xx. 28, and 1 Pet. v. 2), yet it is an undeniable fact that the Greek word for *bishop* never occurs in the sense of an overseer of the Pastors of the Church, but always signifies an overseer of the flock.

133. *What are the duties of the Pastor?*

It is his duty not only to preach the Word, but also to conduct all the parts of public worship—by dispensing the ordinances of the Church and administering Church discipline, as also to inspect the religious state of persons

and families. (2 Tim. iv. 2; 1 Cor. x. 16; Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. v. 20.)

134. *What are the duties of the Elder?*

The *Elder* is to assist the Pastor in all duties connected with the oversight of the flock, with the exception of labouring in word and doctrine.

135. *What are the duties of the Deacon?*

The Deacon is appointed to attend to the wants of the poor, and also to manage other temporalities in the Church. (Acts vi. 2, 3; 1 Tim iii. 8; Phil. i. 1.)

136. *How are the Office-bearers of the Church to be appointed to their respective duties?*

They are to be *elected* by the members of the Church (Acts i. 15—23), and *ordained* by the rulers of the Church. (1 Tim. iv. 14; Acts vi. 3—6.)

137. *What are the Courts of the Church?*

Of three kinds, namely: the Session, the Presbytery, and the Synod. The latter word may include Provincial Synods, National Assemblies, and General Councils. (1 Cor. xiv. 23; Acts xiv. 23; Matt. xviii. 15—20; 1 Tim iv. 14; Acts xi. 29, 30.)

138. *What are the various ACTS OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP connected with the Church?*

In addition to those acts of worship which are strictly private, and those public ordinances—such as Covenanting, &c.—which do not properly belong to the worship of God

in the congregation, the stated public worship of Zion comprehends prayer, singing psalms, the Word preached, collection for pious purposes, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and blessing the congregation. (Heb. x. 25; Psalm xcv. 1; Mark xiv. 26; James v. 13; Mark xvi. 15, 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Acts ii. 41, 42; 1 Cor. xi. 23—34; 2 Cor. xiii. 14.)

139. *What is Church Discipline?*

It is "the exercise of ecclesiastical power, for the prevention and correction of offences in the visible Church." (2 Cor. x. 8.)

140. *In whom hath Christ lodged the power of administering Church discipline?*

In the ecclesiastical rulers exclusively. (Matt. xxviii. 19, xvi. 19.)

141. *How do you explain the case of discipline recorded in 1 Cor. v. 1—5, and 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7?*

It is to be explained on the principle of a distinction being made between an *authoritative* and a *concurrent* judgment. Such a distinction is recognised in Matt. xix. 28, and 1 Cor. vi. 2. The case alluded to was one of *public excommunication*; and, "as the sentence implied separation from Christian fellowship," while it must have been pronounced by the elders of the Church, it could not be fully executed without the concurrent action of the

members; and the penalty, from its very nature, was therefore "inflicted of many."

142. *Who are the proper subjects of Church discipline?*

Church members, including children. (Titus ii. 12; 1 Cor. v. 12.)

143. *What is the character of those offences which render an individual liable to Church discipline?*

They are such as may expose the Church to reproach, mar the edification of the saints, and tempt others to sin. (Luke xvii. 1; Rom. xiv. 13; Rev. ii. 14.)

144. *How many kinds of censurable offences may there be?*

Three kinds, namely: heresy, immorality, and contempt of Church order. (Rom. xvi. 17; Titus iii. 10; 1 Cor. v. 11.)

145. *What are the different kinds of Church censure?*

Admonition, rebuke, suspension from sealing ordinances, and excommunication. Admonition and rebuke may be administered, according to the character of the scandal, secretly in the family, before the Session, or in presence of the whole Church. (Titus i. 13; 1 Tim. v. 20.)

SECTION V.

DOCTRINES OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH—COVENANTING.

146. *What is a COVENANT?*

A Covenant is an agreement between two parties, on certain conditions.

147. *What is a religious Covenant?*

It is a solemn transaction, by which an individual or a social body lays hold of the Covenant of Grace, binding himself or itself to the performance of certain duties, resting for grace and acceptance on the everlasting promises.

148. *Can Covenants bind to that which is in opposition to the truth?*

No: it is impossible that any engagement on the part of man can make that which is duty to be sin, or that which is sin to be duty. (See Numbers xxx., throughout; and Acts xxiii. 12.)

149. *Seeing, then, that Covenants ought to embrace nothing but what is Scriptural and moral, and inasmuch as moral and Scriptural truth is in itself infinitely binding, are not Covenants, if not pernicious, at least unnecessary?*

This objection, though plausible, is most deceptive. True, the obligation of the law of

God is infinite, and hence this obligation cannot be increased; but, *our* obligation to keep the law of God may be increased. A Covenant superadds a new obligation, on our part, to keep the Divine law. An oath cannot make truth more true, but it increases our obligation to speak the truth; hence, the breach of an oath is not only *lying*, but *perjury*.

150. *Have we any examples of PERSONAL COVENANTING in the Scriptures?*

Yes: we read of Jacob's vow at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 20—22); of Jephthah's vow at Mizpeh (Judges xi. 29—40); of Hannah's vow (1 Sam. i. 11); and in Psalm lxvi. 13, 14, the Psalmist speaks of paying the *vows* which his mouth had spoken when he was in trouble. (See also Numbers xxx. 2, and Psalm cxxxii. 2—5.)

151. *When may a vow or personal Covenant be entered into?*

When an individual, out of faith and conscience of duty, in way of thanksgiving for mercy received or for the obtaining of what he wants, is graciously disposed to bind himself to necessary duty, or to other things, so far and so long as they may fitly conduce thereunto. (Deut. xxiii. 21—23; Psalm l. 14.)

152. *How ought Personal Covenants to be entered into?*

They ought to be entered into deliberately, cheerfully, with the utmost solemnity, and

with a holy resolution as to the performance of the stipulated duties.

153. *What is a NATIONAL COVENANT?*

A National Covenant is a mutual stipulation entered into by a people and their rulers, by which, in a professed taking hold of the Covenant of Grace, they publicly pledge themselves to the performance of certain duties which they owe to God and one another.

154. *Is not National Covenanting, as thus defined, a religious transaction?*

Yes: it is a duty based on the Moral Law, commanded and exemplified in the Word of God, and, being a solemn appeal to the justice and omniscience of Jehovah, is to be viewed as a direct act of religious worship.

155. *May not a National Covenant comprehend things both civil and religious?*

Yes: to unite things civil and religious is not to blend things sacred and common, as is often said. The necessity, occasionally, of embracing civil and religious objects in one bond will appear from the fact that things

Note to question 152.—Many pious divines have written on the subject of Personal Covenanting. It has been the opinion of a large number of those, that acts of self-dedication to God, or Personal Covenants, ought to be not only in express words, but also in writing. The reader is directed specially to Boston's Memorial concerning Personal and Family Fasting, and Doddridge's Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul, chap. xvii.

civil and religious are sometimes so closely connected that the one may be assailed through the other. Moreover, Scripture authorizes the connexion, as is evident from the Covenant referred to in Neh. x. 29. Here the Covenanters entered into "a curse" and "an oath" to walk in "God's law," and to "do all the commandments of the Lord"—both first and second table duties. We are also commanded to "fear God and honour the king."

156. *Is not National Covenanting an occasional duty?*

Although it can scarcely be said that this duty is ever unseasonable, yet, like fasting and thanksgiving, special seasons give special calls to its performance. By the Church of old, covenanting was resorted to in times of deliverance from danger, in seasons of deep distress, in times of backsliding, as well as in seasons of prosperity. (Exod. xix.; 2 Kings xi. 17; Deut. xxix. 9; Josh. xxiv. 25; Neh. ix. 38; Isa. xlv. 3—5; Psalm l. 15, lxxvi. 6—11.)

157. *Is not the duty of Public, Social, or National Covenanting, when entered upon in a Scriptural manner, and with due regard to providential calls, calculated to be very beneficial?*

Most certainly. Preparation for the duty tends to cherish a devout solemnity of mind, and leads to more accurate apprehensions of truth; it impresses the conscience with a sense

of duty, promotes intercourse with God, re-proves the backwardness of the heart; and, by uniting the friends of truth in sentiment, affection, and holy resolves, it serves to secure the Church's stability in troublous times, furnishes a powerful means of resisting adversaries, and of providing precious privileges for unborn generations.

158. *What is the HISTORY of NATIONAL COVENANTING?*

We find it practised, with Divine approbation, by the Jews; the duty was attended to by the Primitive Christians; with the dawn of the Reformation in Europe the practice was revived; and it has continued to be acted upon, less or more, by various denominations of Christians, till the present time.

159. *What instances of National Covenanting, in the history of the Jewish people, can you adduce?*

After their deliverance from Egypt, the children of Israel entered into a public, social Covenant at Mount Sinai (see Ex. xix., &c.); forty years after, they did the same on the plains of Moab (Dent. xxvi. 16—19); immediately before his death, Joshua made a covenant with the Jewish nation at Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 1, 25); and several similar covenants were entered into by the reforming kings of Judah, as well as in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, after the return from Babylon. (See 2 Kings

xi. 17, xxiii. 1, 2 ; 2 Chron. xv. 1—19 ; Neh. ix. 38, x. 29.)

160. *On what authority do you say that Covenanting was practised by the Primitive Christians ?*

On the authority of credible historians. The younger Pliny represents the early Christians, in their meetings for the worship of God, as binding themselves by a solemn oath to what was known duty.* Justin Martyr represents baptism to adults as given only to those of them who vowed to live according to the confession of their faith. Jerome and Tertullian allude to the same thing. Irenæus, Origen, and, in the latter day, Gregory Nazianzen, might also be referred to in proof of the existence, in those early days, of the practice of Covenanting.

161. *Had not the early Reformers and Reformed Churches frequent recourse to the practice of Covenanting ?*

Yes : with the dawn of the Reformation, the practice of Covenanting also appeared. Step by step, the Churches proceeded, in opposition to Popery, by solemn engagements. "The history of the Church's Reformation is written in her Covenants." Milner says, that various conventions of the princes in Germany were held, in different places, for the promotion and

* See Pliny's letter to Trajan, as mentioned by Stackhouse at the end of his History.

defence of true religion. On 7th November, 1525, the Electoral Prince of Saxony, the Landgrave, &c., held a meeting at the castle of Friedewald, in the forest of Sulligen, and formed a resolution to act in concert, and thus produced "the first elements of an evangelical league." (See D'Aubigné, vol. ii., p. 377.)

162. *Are there any similar instances to be recorded?*

There are. In 1530, the League of Smalcald was entered into by the Protestants of Germany. On 20th July, 1537, the principal articles of the Christian religion and discipline were sworn by the Senate and people of Geneva. Berne and Lausanne were also included in the League. In 1571, the Swiss and German Reformers entered into a solemn bond in conjunction with the Waldensian Churches to maintain inviolate the ancient union among the faithful of the evangelical religion. The Churches of Holland, Hungary, Transylvania, and France, had recourse to Covenanting; and the practice extended to America, so that settlers from Europe, at Salem, in 1629, incorporated themselves into a Church of Christ by Covenanting.

163. *In which of all the nations of Christendom do we discover the most eminent example of Public, Social Covenanting, anywhere to be found since the reforming periods of Judah and Israel?*

In this respect the Churches and nation of Britain stand pre-eminent.

164. *Were there any instances of Covenanting in Britain previous to the periods when the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant were entered into?*

There were a number of such instances. At an early period of the Reformation in Scotland, local and temporary covenants were framed. The first of these was drawn up immediately after the return of John Knox from England, in 1556. Most of the gentlemen in Angus and Mearns did, at this time, make profession of the true religion, and entered into a bond in which they renounced the Popish communion, and engaged to maintain the true preaching of the Gospel as God should give them opportunity. The next bond was entered into at Perth, May, 1559. The third was made at Stirling, in August of the same year; the fourth at Edinburgh, in April, 1560; and the fifth at Ayr, in September 1562.

165. *In what respects do the National Covenant of Scotland and the Solemn League and Covenant of the three kingdoms differ from the above-mentioned bonds?*

There are at least two marked and essential points of difference. The Covenants entered into in the dawn of the Reformation in Scotland were chiefly of a local and temporary nature, whereas the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant were national deeds;

and, also, unlike the local bonds, had a regard to the continued identity of the National Society.

166. Present a brief outline of the history and of the contents of the National Covenant?

The National Covenant, as contained in the Confession of Faith, consists of three parts. The first of these is the Old Covenant of 1580, which was drawn up by John Craig, and which contains two distinct points: *first*, an engagement to adhere to the Reformed religion, as expressed in the Scots Confession; and, *secondly*, a solemn abjuration of all the abominations of Popery, as also an engagement to defend the king's person and government, and the civil liberties of the nation.

167. When were the other two parts added?

In 1638. The second or middle part was drawn up by Johnston, of Warriston, and consists of a number of Acts of Parliament, passed during a period of sixty years, for condemning and abolishing Popery, and for protecting and establishing the true religion. "This part of the Covenant cannot be viewed as a part of the engagement, but was drawn up and appended in 1638, to show that the steps taken by the Reformers were perfectly legal and constitutional." The third part was drawn up by Alexander Henderson, and contains a special application of the principles of the Covenant to Popish Prelacy.

168. *What is the history of the Solemn League and Covenant?*

The Solemn League and Covenant owes its existence to the National Covenant of Scotland. "It was occasioned by the struggle maintained by an arbitrary and Popishly-affected court" against the friends of Reformation and liberty in the nation. England, in her struggle with the despotic power of the king and his prelates, was led to turn her eyes to Covenanted Scotland. In a letter sent by the Assembly of Divines in England to the General Assembly of the Scottish Church are found the following words:—"In a deeper sense of this danger than we can well express, we address you in the bowels of Christ for your most fervent prayers and advice, what further to do for the making of our own and the kingdom's peace with God, and for uniting the Protestant party more firmly, that we may all serve God with one consent, and stand up against Antichrist as one man."

169. *Did Scotland respond to the cry from England?*

Yes; and a committee of Assembly was appointed, along with the Commissioners from England, to prepare a draft of a Covenant. The draft was drawn up by Alexander Henderson, and, after careful consideration, was approved by the General Assembly and Convention of Estates, and was cordially subscribed by persons of all ranks in Scotland, in

the year 1643. After undergoing a strict examination, and a few slight alterations, in the Westminster Assembly, it was adopted by that body. It was also approved of by both Houses of Parliament; and on Monday, the 25th of September, 1643, it was solemnly sworn in the Church of St. Margaret's, Westminster, by both Houses of Parliament, by the Assembly of Divines, and by persons of different ranks generally throughout England. In Ireland, also, the Covenant was taken by many Protestants in the South, and by almost the whole body of the Protestant population of the North.

170. *What is the grand object contemplated in the Solemn League and Covenant?*

The grand object contemplated in this bond is, perhaps, the most glorious anywhere to be found in the international transactions of the world. From reading the Covenant, it will be perceived that it embraces six particular items; but the whole may be summed up in one sentence, namely: "The preservation of the Reformed religion in Scotland, the Reformation of religion in England and Ireland, and the bringing of the Churches in the three kingdoms to the nearest conformity in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government."

171. *Can you point to any valuable results which have already flowed from the Solemn League as their instrumental cause?*

Among the fruits immediately flowing from this document may be mentioned the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the propositions concerning Church Government, the Directory for Public Worship, and the Metrical Version of the Psalms. At the same time, an impulse was given to the higher departments of literature, and also to education, while practical godliness was revived. In the words of an eloquent writer: "There can be no doubt in the mind of any intelligent and thoughtful man, that on it (*the Solemn League*) mainly rests, under Providence, the noble structure of the British Constitution. But for it, as far as man can judge, these kingdoms would have been placed beneath the deadening bondage of absolute despotism; and in the fate of Britain the liberty and civilization of the world would have sustained a fatal, paralyzing shock."

172. How do you prove THE DUTY OF ENTERING INTO *National Covenants*?

I appeal not only to reason, but also to the Word of God. The light of nature, approved examples of Covenanting in Old Testament times, Scripture precepts, arguments from the New Testament, Old Testament prophecies in relation to the performance of the duty in New Testament times, as also the beneficial tendency of national covenanting, all combine to form an immoveable basis on which to rest the important doctrine.

173. *How do you appeal to the light of nature in proof of the doctrine?*

Whatever can be established as a fact, or deduced as a truth, flowing from nature as such, is in accordance with the Divine will. (See Rom. ii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 14). It is clearly, then, a dictate of reason, that men are bound to dedicate themselves to the Lord by whom they live. And as we are dependent on God socially, as well as personally, it is reasonable that we should devote ourselves to Him in our social character. Moreover, the history of the heathen, as regards the teaching of moralists, and the actual performance of the duty, abundantly manifests that vowing is in accordance with the light of nature.

174. *Out of a number of examples that might be given, present one from the writings of heathen moralists, in which the duty of vowing is taught?*

Epictetus (Lib. I cap. 14) writes thus:—
 “To this God ye ought to swear an oath, such as the soldiers swear to Cæsar. They, indeed, by the inducement of their wages, swear that they will value the safety of Cæsar before all things; and will you, then, honoured with so many and so great benefits, not swear to God, or, having sworn, will you not continue steadfast?”

175. *Do the Scriptures furnish us with any example of vowing performed by heathens, under the influence of natural conscience?*

Yes: the mariners of Tarshish, being much impressed with the awful majesty of that Being who was able to quell the raging sea, "offered a sacrifice unto the Lord, and made vows." (Jonah i. 16.)

176. *What are some of the approved examples of Covenanting, in the Old Testament times, to which you refer?*

The Old Testament abounds with such examples. The children of Israel, in their national and ecclesiastical capacity, entered into a public, social Covenant at Mount Sinai, after their deliverance from Egypt. (See Exod. xix., xx., xxi., xxii., xxiii., xxiv.) That there was a national Covenant entered into by the Israelites at Sinai few will deny. "The words which the Lord commanded" were "laid before" the people, and "all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do" (chap. xix. 7, 8); and the transaction is spoken of as a "Covenant," chap. xxiv. 7, 8.)

177. *What other instances do you adduce?*

Forty years after the Covenant at Sinai, the Israelites entered into a Covenant on the plains of Moab (Deut. xxvi. 16—19); Joshua, immediately before his death, made a covenant with the Jewish nation at Schechem (Josh. xxiv. 1—25); similar covenants were entered into, in the days of Jehoshaphat, Josiah, and Asa, reforming kings of Judah (2 Kings xi. 17,

xxiii. 1, 2; 2 Chron. xv. 1—19); and after the return from Babylon, in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, the whole people, with their rulers, entered into Covenant with God. (Neh. ix. 38, x. 29.) On all these occasions there was an acknowledgment of moral obligation, and a formal engagement or vow to serve the Lord.

178. *What Scripture precepts do you refer to in proof of the doctrine you maintain?*

In Deut. x. 20, the command is given to Israel, "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God; Him shalt thou serve, and to Him shalt thou cleave, *and swear by His name.*" Eccl. v. 4 implies that vowing was at least permitted: "When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it." God has sworn by Himself, "Unto me every knee shall bow, *every tongue shall swear.*" (Isa. xlv. 23.) "And thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness. (Jer. iv. 2.) "Vow, and pay unto the Lord your God." (Ps. lxxvi. 11.) And in Hezekiah's proclamation in regard to the solemn passover kept in his reign are the words:—"Be not stiff-necked, as your fathers were, but *yield* yourselves unto the Lord (Heb., *give the hand* unto the Lord), and enter into His sanctuary." (2 Chron. xxx. 8.)

179. *Do not the first three precepts of the Decalogue enjoin, at least by implication, the duty of vowing unto God?*

Yes: the first commandment requireth us to "know and acknowledge God to be the only true God, and our God, and to worship and glorify Him accordingly"; and the Westminster divines give it as their judgment, that public and joint swearing to the Lord is one of the ways in which He requires us to acknowledge Him. According to the Larger Catechism, "a vowing unto God" is one of those institutions which the second commandment requires us to receive and observe. That oaths are required or allowed in the third commandment, is generally acknowledged; and, if we may swear, in order to decide controversy between man and man, it seems strange if we are not also allowed, and even required, to employ the same means in seeking to decide the great controversy between Christ and Belial.

180. *What is the nature of the argument for Covenanting drawn from the New Testament?*

It is threefold. First, the New Testament does not abrogate the ordinance; secondly, there are in the New Testament certain general principles which afford a strong presumptive proof in support of the doctrine; and, thirdly, the New Testament contains passages directly bearing on the subject.

181. *What use do you make of the fact, that Covenanting is not abrogated in the New Testament?*

The question is not whether Covenanting is

instituted, but whether it is repealed, in the New Testament. The Church is one in all ages, and every precept and ordinance enjoined in the Old Testament continues binding, unless repealed in the New. It is evident that Covenanting was instituted in Old Testament times, but we do not read of its being repealed. If a formal New Testament command be requisite to constitute Covenanting a Scriptural duty, then it follows that the observance of the Sabbath on the first day of the week, the admission of infants to baptism, the dispensation of the Lord's Supper to females, and the observance of family worship, are not in accordance with the Divine law.

182. *What are some of those general principles contained in the New Testament, which afford a presumptive proof for the doctrine of Covenanting?*

In the New Testament, Christ is revealed as King of Zion, and also King of Nations; and it is very reasonable to suppose that both Church and State are bound to swear allegiance to the "King of kings and Lord of lords." (Ephes i. 21—23; Rev. xix. 16.) In various passages, Christ is set forth as the Husband, and His Church as the spouse, and such a relationship implies a vow. (Ephes. v. 22—32.) Christ is made known as the Master, and the relation of master and servant involves a federal compact. (Matt. xxiii. 10.) It were also easy to show that ministerial

ordination, as well as baptism and the Lord's Supper, involves the idea of oath or vow.

183. *To what passages do you allude which bear more directly on the subject of Covenanting?*

In Rom. i. 31, "Covenant-breakers" are ranked with fornicators, murderers, and the most abandoned transgressors; and not only so, but, in the connexion in which the passage stands, Covenant-breaking is set forth as a sin opposed to the very *light of nature*. Now, if Covenant-breaking is a sin, it can be so only on the principle of the moral obligation of Covenants. Again, the Churches of Macedonia are represented as giving themselves to the Lord:—"This they did, not as we hoped, but first gave their own selves to the Lord." (2 Cor. viii. 5.)

184. *How do you show that 2 Cor. viii. 5, bears upon the subject of Covenanting?*

This passage affords only *presumptive* evidence; yet it is worthy of remark, that the very language applied to Covenanting in other parts of Scripture is employed. The words cannot apply to the Christians of Macedonia making a public profession of Christianity—this they had done before; nor can they apply to baptismal dedication, for this would be done when a profession of religion was made; neither can a reference be made to the Lord's Supper, for the Apostle would not then have said, "Not as we hoped"—as he, no doubt, expected them

to observe this ordinance frequently. Hence, some public, formal, solemn dedication of themselves to God—or, in other words, an act of Covenanting—seems to have been referred to by the Apostle. Moreover, the command in Rom. vi. 13—"Yield yourselves unto the Lord"—when compared with 2 Chron. xxx. 8, seems to inculcate the duty for which we plead.

185. *Is not the duty of Covenanting evident from the language of prophecy?*

It is. In Psalm lxviii. 31, it is predicted that "princes shall come out of Egypt: Ethiopia shall stretch out her hand (*the form of taking an oath*) unto the Lord." Isaiah, referring to New Testament times, says:—"The Egyptians shall vow a vow unto the Lord, and perform it"; and, again, "They shall swear unto the Lord." (Isaiah xix. 18—21.) In allusion to the various modes in which Covenanting was performed during the former dispensation, the same prophet declares, "One shall say, I am the Lord's, and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." (See Isaiah xlv. 5.)

186. *In addition to the above, is not the language of Jeremiah very explicit on this point?*

Yes; his words are:—"In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of

Judah together, going and weeping: they shall go and seek the Lord their God. They shall ask the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, saying, Come and let us join ourselves to the Lord, in a perpetual Covenant that shall not be forgotten." (Jer. l. 4, 5.) In connexion with this passage, Zech. ii. 11 may be consulted.

187. *How does it appear that the phrase—"In those days, and in that time"—used by Jeremiah, has an allusion to the Gospel dispensation?*

This is evident from the language of the passage. The children of Israel are mentioned as well as the children of Judah; and as Israel were not carried to Babylon, but to Assyria (and hence could not return from Babylon), it is manifest that a restoration and reformation, subsequent to Old Testament times, is the grand subject of the prophet's prediction.

188. *May not an argument in support of the duty of public, social, or national Covenanting be deduced from the extremely beneficial nature of the exercise?*

Most certainly. In the common affairs of life man finds it necessary to Covenant with man, and nation with nation; and without Covenanting, tacit or avowed, the vast framework of society must instantly be dissolved. How strange, then, to imagine that a principle, which is so beneficial and necessary when

applied to every other department, should lose all its propriety and utility when brought to bear on that which is man's grand concern and unspeakable interest for time and eternity!

189. *What do you intend by the DESCENDING or CONTINUED OBLIGATION of public, social, or national Covenants?*

I intend that the moral subject (the nation, or Church, or both), having pledged its faith to that God who keepeth Covenant, is at every after period of its existence, till the objects of the Covenant are accomplished, *bound by the distinct intrinsic obligation of the Covenant*; so that, in refusing to perform the stipulations of its plighted faith, it stands chargeable, not merely with disobedience to the Divine law, but also with breach of promise, and it may be, also, with the crime of *perjury*.

190. *On what principles do you rest the advocacy of the doctrine in question?*

The distinct, continued, or descending obligation of public social Covenants arises from the unchangeable obligation of moral and Christian duty, from the moral identity of the social body, and more especially from the Divine will as revealed in the Scriptures.

191. *Does not the moral identity of the national society require that such a latitude of view should be connected with the idea of continued obligation?*

It does. The social body is a moral subject,

and as such is rewarded or punished by the Supreme Being. "The identity of a nation, as existing through different ages, is, in all moral respects, as real as the identity of an individual through the whole period of his life. The individuals that compose it, like the particles of matter in the human body, pass away, and are succeeded by others, but the body politic continues essentially the same."

192. *Do we find men, in the common affairs of life, recognising and acting upon the principle just alluded to?*

Yes; hence, debts contracted, on certain kinds of property, by the parent, descend as a burden upon the heir; debts contracted by the British Government a century ago are still acknowledged as real debts; the Magna Charta granted by King John, and confirmed by his son, Henry III., six hundred years ago, is still considered as constituting the very charter of English liberty; and the Revolution Settlement is still viewed by the nation as equally binding now as it was by those who first entered into it.

193. *Does not the Most High himself acknowledge the righteousness of this principle?*

Yes: this will appear if we consider the first moral constitution under which our first parents were placed, and the awful and continued consequences of the violation of the Covenant of Works. (See 1 Cor. xv. 22; Rom. v. 12—19).

It will also be manifest from a consideration of the very name of God, His memorial to all generations, when He styles Himself "the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob," in which designation God is represented as transacting with the fathers on behalf of their children.

194. *Is not the principle of federal representation taught in Heb. vii. 9, 10?*

Yes: in this passage we learn that "Levi paid tithes in Abraham, for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him"; and, whatever other truth this scripture may be designed to inculcate, it clearly teaches that Levi, although then unborn, was properly represented by his father Abraham in the matter of paying tithes to Melchisedec.

195. *What other Scripture proof do you mention in support of the continued obligation of Covenants?*

Such expressions as "the everlasting Covenant" (Isaiah xxiv. 5), "a perpetual Covenant" (Jer. l. 5), &c., must lose much of their import, if only one generation is intended to be represented. Even as regards matters of a civil nature, the principle of federal representation is acknowledged in Scripture. Forty years' wandering in the wilderness, the death of a whole generation, together with all the wars of Canaan, did not cause the children of Israel to disregard the oath of their fathers; for even

two hundred years after the oath had been sworn to Joseph, they buried his bones in Shechem. (Exod. xiii. 19.)

196. *What other Scripture passages do you appeal to?*

The case of the Gibeonites is remarkable. The Israelites were punished with three years' famine, because Saul, their king, had slain a number of the Gibeonites. And it is to be remarked that this punishment was inflicted, not, as some assert, because in their destruction the Israelites acted from bad motives, nor because the Gibeonites had become proselytes to the true religion, but because of the violation of the oath entered into by their fathers with the Gibeonites, as is clear from the words of the narrative, in which the cause of the famine is stated thus:—"And the children of Israel had sworn unto them." (2 Sam. xxi. 1—9.) Again, more than two hundred years after the league between Solomon and Hiram had been entered into, the Lord threatens the inhabitants of Tyre with desolating judgments, "because they delivered up the whole captivity of Edom, and remembered not the brotherly Covenant." (Amos i. 9.)

197. *But can you not appeal to Scripture, if possible, of a still more conclusive nature, in relation to this subject?*

Yes: posterity is charged with the guilt of violating Covenants made with ancestors:

"They are turned back to the iniquity of their forefathers, which refused to hear my words; and they went after other gods to serve them: the house of Israel and the house of Judah have broken my Covenant which I made with their fathers." (Jer. xi. 10.) Still more explicit are the words of Moses to the thousands of Israel on the plains of Moab; for, in relation to the transactions at Sinai, entered into forty years before the time when Moses addressed the words to Israel, and when he, Caleb, and Joshua, were the only three original Covenanters alive, he declares:—"The Lord our God made a Covenant with us in Horeb: the Lord made not this Covenant with our fathers, but with us, even with us, who are all of us here alive this day." (Deut. v. 2, 3.)

198. *Is not the principle of the continued obligation of Covenants often in Scripture made a plea in supplicating the Divine mercy?*

Yes, frequently. Hence, for example, Jeremiah exclaims:—"Do not abhor us for thy name's sake: remember, *break not thy Covenant with us.*" (See Jer. xiv. 21.)

199. *On the other hand, does not Jehovah himself frequently rest a plea on the same principle, why punishment should fall upon the guilty?*

He does. In the suppositional case stated by Moses (Deut. xxix. 25) to inquirers after the cause of the conditional infliction of sweeping desolations on the Jewish race, the em-

phatic reply is given—" *Because they have forsaken the Covenant of the Lord God of THEIR FATHERS.*"

200. *May we not also appeal to the beneficial tendency of the doctrine in question as an argument in its defence?*

Most certainly. It is calculated to inspire a sense of gratitude to the Most High, that in transacting with the fathers He has a regard to the children; it creates the confidence that the Lord, who has been the God of the fathers, will also be the children's God; it affords an argument in pleading with Jehovah; it throws a shield, as it were, over a people to avert the Divine wrath; it serves to keep up a remembrance of the past; it furnishes a medium for the transmission, from generation to generation, of the record of God's mighty doings on behalf of Zion; and, above all, it is eminently calculated to display the unity of the Church as a grand Covenant society in all ages.

201. *And, finally, may not the truth of the doctrine be confirmed by a consideration of the effects which would result from its practical denial?*

A practical denial of the doctrine must lead to the most disastrous consequences. Not to hint at the idea of the Supreme Being himself failing in relation to the stipulations of the Covenant of man's salvation, to what, as regards human affairs, will a disregard of the principle lead? Deny the principle, and the

subject not born at the time of the coronation of the prince may justly rise up in rebellion against his sovereign, and in turn the prince may refuse such a subject his civil rights; the heir may refuse to acknowledge the liabilities of his predecessor; and some stronger man may refuse to acknowledge the rights of the heir: and, in one word, national deeds, however important, at once lose all their value in sustaining and regulating national concerns.

SECTION VI.

DOCTRINES OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH HAVE A REGARD TO MAN IN HIS
CIVIL RELATIONS.

202. *What do you intend by the civil relations of man?*

Those relations which he sustains, and those duties which are required of him *as a member of civil society.*

203. *What do you mean by civil society?*

I mean the national society, or the *State* as contrasted with the *Church.*

204. *What is the origin of civil government?*

"Civil government is not merely the suggestion of necessity, nor the invention of man, like the arts and sciences, but a moral ordinance of God, for the Divine glory and individual and social good" (1 Cor. xi. 14; Rom. xiii. 2; Exod. xviii. 21, 22; 1 Tim. ii. 2); and, like marriage, &c., civil government is placed in a state of moral subjection to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of the kings of the earth. (Heb. ii. 8; Psalm ii. 10—12; Dan. vii. 14—27.)

205. *When you say that the doctrines of the Reformed Presbyterian Church have a regard to man in his civil relations, what do you intend thereby?*

I mean that man, as a Christian, is bound, in all the civil relations of life, to act on Christian principles; and, also, that a nation, enjoying the light of Divine revelation, is placed under the necessity of aiming not only at the good of man, but also at the Divine glory, making the Word of God the supreme standard of duty in the whole of the national procedure. (1 Cor. x. 31.)

206. *Is not this principle distinctly denied by a large class of professing Christians?*

Yes: those usually denominated *Voluntaries* maintain that there is to be a complete separation between Church and State; or, in other words, that *politics* have nothing to do with *religion*.

207. *On what grand Scripture doctrine do you rest the proof of the assertion that nations, as such, are bound to aim at the Divine glory in all national acts?*

On the doctrine of the SUPREME HEADSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST OVER NATIONS. (Ephes. i. 21, 22.)

208. *What do you understand by Christ's headship over nations?*

I understand by it that supreme moral authority and providential rule which Christ

exercises, not merely as God, but also as Mediator, over all the political associations of mankind.

209. *What evidence do you adduce in proof of Christ's mediatorial dominion over all the civil associations of mankind?*

First, it is evidently implied in the universality of the mediatorial supremacy (Matt. xxviii. 18; Col. ii. 10; 1 Peter iii. 22; Heb. ii. 8); *secondly*, the Saviour is designated by a number of titles which clearly imply the doctrine; as, when he is called "Governor among the nations"; God's "First-born, higher than the kings of the earth"; "Prince of the kings of the earth"; "King of kings, and Lord of lords" (Psalm xxii. 28; lxxxix. 27; Rev. i. 5; xix. 16); *thirdly*, civil rulers are frequently commanded to render subjection to the Saviour (Psalm ii. 10—12; Rom. xiii. 1—7; Titus iii. 1); and, *fourthly*, inspired predictions, in regard to Messiah's reign, prove his dominion over the nations of the world. (Psalm lxxii. 10, 11; Dan. vii. 14; Psalm xlvii. 2—9; Isaiah xlix. 22, 23.)

210. *Does not the supreme headship of Christ over the nations lay the latter under solemn obligation to render due allegiance to the Prince of the kings of the earth?*

Most certainly. Nations, being moral subjects of the Redeemer (Psalm xliii. 1; Isaiah x. 6; Ezek. ii. 3), are bound to take His laws as the supreme standard of right and wrong (Deut.

iv. 5—8; xvii. 18—20; Josh. i. 8); to have respect to the moral and religious qualifications of those who occupy places of power and trust in the nation (Exod. xviii. 21; Deut. i. 13; Eccl. x. 16; 2 Sam. xxiii. 3); to swear allegiance to Him; and to aim at His glory in all that they do—the ruler ruling in the fear of the Lord, and the ruled having a respect to Christ in their civil allegiance. (2 Sam. xxiii. 3; Rom. xiii. 1—7.)

211. *How are Christians to conduct themselves when it is their lot to live under a constitution whose administrators either have not been made acquainted with the Divine law, or who refuse to act according to its righteous precepts?*

In this case it is their duty to bear true allegiance to the Saviour, by abstaining from all sinful and ensnaring connexions, refusing to be partakers of other men's sins (1 Tim. v. 22); and by seeking to inculcate, as far as practicable, correct views of the duties which men owe, in all the relations of life, to the exalted Mediator. (Dan. iii. 18).

212. *But may not good men be more useful by homologating an unscriptural system, taking part in the general management of affairs, and seeking thereby to produce a better state of matters, than by a simple withdrawal from the political arena?*

By no means. We are never to do evil that good may come. (Rom. iii. 8). When the Re-

former cannot effect a reformation of evils without wounding conscience, he is bound at once to protest and withdraw. (See Psalm xciv. 20.)

213. *But does not the fact of dwelling on the soil, bind up all the inhabitants of a country in such a manner in the national society, that they cannot avoid being partakers of the national guilt?*

Certainly not. True, those who either in a tacit or avowed manner incorporate with the national society are partakers of its guilt, and nothing but a faithful protest against prevailing corruptions can deliver from the guilt of such a connexion. Nevertheless, it is equally true, that God shall graciously distinguish those who are led to utter such a protest, and who keep themselves separate, by refusing to touch any "unclean thing." Hence, when the messengers of death are sent forth to punish for the sins of the land, the Lord gives command to "set a mark" upon the foreheads of them who sigh and cry for the abominations done in the midst thereof (See Ezekiel ix. 4); and hence, also, the "two witnesses" are represented as keeping themselves separate from the Antichristian governments of the Latin earth for a period of 1,260 years. (See Rev. xi.)

214. *But does not the fact of the existence of a power, require that Christians render to that power, obedience for conscience' sake?*

The absurd doctrine of "passive obedience" has been founded upon a perverted interpretation of the xiii. chap. of the Epistle to the Romans—"The powers that be are ordained of God," it is said, and, therefore, all are bound to submit to whatever power exists in the providence of God! But that the Apostle, in the above passage, is not treating *specifically* of the then existing Roman government, but of civil government *generally*—laying down, in fact, the inspired canon by which civil government is to be conducted—appears evident from the following considerations:—

215. *What is your first argument in proof of this view of the passage?*

The first argument in proof of this view of the passage is founded upon the import of the the terms employed by the Apostle. The best Greek scholars allow that the Greek words rendered "higher powers," do not signify all sorts of authority, but such as protect men in the enjoyment of their just rights and privileges. "Power," in the original, generally signifies *moral*, as contrasted with *physical* power, and for the most part denotes *just and lawful power*, and is seldom used in relation to tyrants and oppressors; hence, Paul's language may, or rather ought to be read, *protecting, or excellent authorities*. Buchanan, Milton, Melville, Locke, Dr. Dick, Dr. McLeod, Dr. W. Symington, and others, take this view of the passage.

216. *What is your second argument?*

That the Apostle is not treating *specifically* of the Roman government seems quite evident from the fact, that he makes no allusion whatever to that government. He uses abstract terms. He speaks of "power," "powers," and "higher powers," but never mentions Cæsar, Nero, or the Roman government.

217. *What is your third argument?*

It is impossible to reconcile the character of the government of Nero, who then wore the Roman purple, with that described by the Apostle. The character of the powers spoken of must be explained by the context, where they are described as "not a terror to good works, but to evil"; "ministers of God for good"; "bearing not the sword in vain"; "revengers, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." But Nero was the very opposite of all this. Nero was a profligate, a cruel and remorseless tyrant, a monster of iniquity, who put his own mother to death, and was accessory to the death of his wife; a despot whom the Roman senate at last condemned to be dragged naked through the streets of Rome, to be whipped to death, and afterwards thrown down the Tarpeian rock, as the meanest malefactor! The most blinded devotee of the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance alone, could teach that this man—the pattern of the most unpardonable wantonness and exe-

crable barbarity—"the common enemy and fury of mankind" (as Pliny calls him)—COULD, by the Spirit of Inspiration, be styled "THE MINISTER OF GOD FOR GOOD" to men!

218. *What is your fourth argument?*

It arises from the nature of the obedience required. It is a voluntary conscientious obedience—"not only for wrath, but also for *conscience*' sake."

219. *What is your fifth argument?*

An argument may be drawn from a comparison of the passage under consideration (See Romans xiii.) with other parts of Scripture. In 1 Cor. vi. 1, the Apostle forbids the saints to go to law before "the unjust"; and, in 2 Tim. iv. 17, the Roman power, or Nero, is called "the lion." If, then, the Roman magistrates at Corinth are designated "unjust," and Nero "a lion," how can the same Apostle designate the same power an ordinance of God? What was "unjust" at Corinth, could not be "God's ordinance" at Rome. In Ephes. vi. 12, we are commanded to resist infernal principles and powers, in the form of the rulers of "the darkness of this world"; and Daniel and John both set forth the Roman empire, under the symbol of a *wild beast*, to which "the devil gave his power, and seat, and great authority." (Dan. vii. 7; Rev. xiii. 2.) To say that Paul represents the Roman government as the offspring and agent of God, while John

sets it forth as the offspring and agent of the devil, is to make Scripture contradict Scripture.

220. *What is your sixth argument?*

If the phrase "powers that be," means every *existing* government, then it follows that there cannot be an unlawful power. If every power that exists in the providence of God is preceptively of God, then it is clear that whosoever resisteth the government of usurpers, tyrants, and persecutors, resisteth the ordinance of God. Nay, more, it also follows that God has made over to these powers the right to trample on his holy law with impunity, and make their own will the standard of political virtue. All such absurd pretensions are put to shame by the Divine declaration:—"They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not." (Hos. viii. 4).

221. *Is it a part of Christian morality to refuse all obediences to immoral tyrannical powers?*

By no means. There is obedience "for wrath" as well as "for conscience' sake."

222. *What is obedience "for wrath's sake"?*

It is obedience from fear of magistratical displeasure.

223. *Ought any power, lawful or unlawful, ever be obeyed while commanding what is immoral?*

Never. The Christian must obey God rather than man.

224. *May an unlawful power be obeyed while commanding what is right?*

Yes: but not because of the command of the unlawful power. In such a case the Christian will be induced to render obedience from the nature of the commands themselves.

CHAPTER IV.

PRACTICE INCULCATED BY THE RE-
FORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

225. *Can any right practical obedience—obedience pleasing to God—be rendered by the individual who is destitute of saving faith?*

No: faith and works are mutually connected as the tree and its fruit. The works of unregenerate men, however, in some respects conformed to the letter of the law, amiable in the eyes of man, and useful to society, cannot be acceptable to the heart searching Jehovah. (See Hag. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 8; Heb. xi. 6.)

226. *Can good works, in any way, merit heaven?*

No: by the law of faith, boasting is wholly excluded. "A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. iii. 27, 28.)

227. *How do you explain the apparent difference between Paul and James in relation to faith and works?*

When Paul declares "that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law" (Rom.

iii. 28), he intends that faith is the alone instrumental cause of salvation, by uniting to the Saviour; and when James asserts "that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only" (James ii. 24), he intends that the faith which does not manifest itself by works, is no faith, is *dead*!

228. *But is it not James' doctrine that, in order to salvation, the sinner must partly believe and partly perform good works, and that faith and works are equally efficacious in the salvation of man?*

By no means. There is no *efficacy*, as regards salvation, either in faith or works. The believer is saved by the imputed righteousness of Christ alone; faith is the instrument that lays hold of the Saviour; and, wherever true faith is, it will manifest itself by acts of holy obedience.

229. *Seeing that good works are destitute of all claim to merit, what is their necessity and value?*

They are necessary to give evidence of grace; to express gratitude; to strengthen assurance; to edify the brethren; to adorn the profession of Christianity; to silence adversaries; to prepare for the fruition of God in heaven, and promote the Divine glory. (Rom. vi. 4, iii. 31; 1 Cor. ix. 21; Titus iii. 3.)

230. *Can those who are destitute of morality be in possession of Christianity?*

No: although mere morality is not evangelical holiness, there can be no Christianity without morality.

231. *What is the STANDARD of Christian practice?*

The practical precepts of Christ, the Saviour's example, the approved examples of the saints, as well as the whole law of the ten commandments, form the standard of Christian practice. (John xv. 14; Rom. iii. 31; Heb. vi. 12; 1 John ii. 6.)

232. *How may we classify the duties included in Christian practice?*

Into those duties which we owe to God, to ourselves, and to man.

233. *How may we classify THOSE DUTIES WHICH THE CHRISTIAN OWES TO GOD?*

Those duties which the Christian more especially owes to God, are *fourfold*; namely, *personal, domestic, private-social, and public-social duties.*

234. *What are the personal duties which the Christian owes to God?*

These are the private reading of the Scriptures (Josh. i. 8; Psalm i. 2), devout meditation (Gen. xxiv. 63; Psalm cxix. 97), secret prayer (Matt. vi. 5—15), praising God (Jas. v. 13; Ephes. v. 19), personal Covenanting, and the observance of seasons of fasting and thanksgiving. (Gen. xxviii. 20; Psalm xxxv. 13; Col. ii. 7.)

235. *What are the domestic duties which a profession of true religion imperatively demands?*

These are the worship of God in the family, including the reading of the Scriptures, praise, and prayer; the instruction of children and domestics; and the religious ordering of all domestic duties.

236. *Can any consistent member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, live in the habitual neglect of family worship?*

No: if he live in the habitual neglect of this duty, he must be a Covenant-breaker.

237. *How do you prove the duty of family worship?*

Family worship is a duty enforced by the very light of nature. The heathen have had, and still have, their household gods and domestic libations. As reason teaches that the creature should pray to the Creator, so it likewise teaches that man should worship God in all the relations in which he has been placed by the Creator.

238. *But can you not prove the duty by an appeal to Scripture?*

Yes: under the law, by Divine appointment, the morning and evening sacrifice was offered up to God, day by day, continually (Exod. xxix. 38—42; Lev. vi. 12; Dan. ix. 21; Exod. xxx. 7); the holy men of God, of whom we read in the Bible, had a great regard to family religion, as is clear from the examples of

Abraham, Job, Joshua, David, and Cornelius (Gen. xviii. 19; Job. i. 5; Joshua xxiv. 15; 1 Chron. xvi. 43; Acts x. 2); and in various passages of the New Testament, we read of "the Church in the house," which expression implies domestic religious exercises. (Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15.)

239. *Can you not adduce still further proof of the Scriptural character of the duty?*

Yes: in Ephes. vi. 18, we are commanded to pray "always," *at every season or every proper occasion*, "with all prayer," that is, prayer of every kind—prayer suited to the occasion; and no more suitable season can be conceived than the morning and evening of each day. Family exercises are evidently alluded to in Zeck. xii. 12—14; the Lord's prayer seems emphatically, though not exclusively, a family prayer. The advantages connected with the exercise, and the evils connected with its non-observance, are also sufficient to prove the duty and necessity of family worship.

240. *What do you understand by private-social worship and fellowship?*

I understand by it the assembling together of a number of fellow-believers, for the purposes of the reading of the Scriptures, prayer, praise, and mutual instruction, and encouragement in Divine things.

241. *Are there any examples of such assemblies in the Divine Word?*

I think so. The following Scriptures seem specially to refer to *private prayer meetings*. (See Dan. ii. 17, 18; Matt. iii. 16; Luke xxiv. 33; Acts i. 14; John xx. 26; Acts xii. 12; xvi. 13.)

242. *What other argument do you bring forward to prove the Scriptural character of private-social prayer meetings?*

The duties of mutual prayer and holy conference, are founded on the law of nature, and are necessary in order to the performance of those duties which Christians owe to each other. From various passages of Scripture it is manifest that there are various duties which Christians owe to each other, which cannot be attended to in the public ordinances of religion, and which, therefore, require some stated mode of association in order efficiently to perform. (Heb. iii. 13, x. 24; John xiii. 35; Rom. xv. 7; 1 Cor. xii. 25; James v. 16.)

243. *Does not the Saviour lay an immovable foundation for such private meetings in Matt. xviii. 19, 20?*

He does. His words are:—"Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father who is in heaven," &c. (See also Luke xxiv. 13—15).

244. *What ought to be the grand leading exercise in the private associations to which you allude?*

Without attempting to cast a slight on other important duties, I think the great leading exercise should be *prayer*. It is a striking fact, that in all, or almost all the Scriptures specified above (See Question 241), the special object connected with the meeting was prayer. Daniel sought the aid of his companions to "*desire mercies of the God of heaven*"; those assembled in the upper room in Jerusalem "*continued with one accord in prayer and supplication*"; those met in the house of Mary, "*were gathered together praying*" (Acts xii. 12); and the place, "*by the river side,*" near the city of Philippi, was a place where "*prayer was wont to be made.*" (See Acts xvi. 13.)

245. *What do you observe in relation to PUBLIC WORSHIP?*

There are four considerations to be taken into account in relation to public worship: *first*, the time when it is to be offered up; *second*, the persons by whom it is to be conducted; *thirdly*, the ordinances themselves; and, *fourthly*, the spirit in which all should be attended to in.

246. *What period of time hath God set apart for the celebration of public worship?*

One whole day in seven, which, since the resurrection of Christ, is the first day of the week; and it is to be wholly occupied in the exercises of Divine worship, except so much as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy. (Acts xx. 7; Matt. xii. 12.)

247. *Is there any day holy in its periodic returns except the Lord's day?*

Not any. The fasts and festivals of the Old Testament Church are done away in Christ (see Col. ii. 16, 17); and although when Providence calls for fasting or thanksgiving, a period of time sufficient for the duty may be lawfully appointed, yet there is no day *holy* except the Sabbath of the Lord. (Exod. xx. 9, 10; Jacob ii. 15.)

248. *What period of time is comprehended in the Christian Sabbath?*

The Christian Sabbath comprehends twenty-four hours, from midnight to midnight. (See John xx. 1—19.)

249. *What is the evil of observing holy days of human appointment?*

Such a practice not only reflects on the wisdom of God (Col. ii. 23); is in direct violation of the Divine law (Exod xx. 9; Ezek. xliii. 8); is a part of Antichristian superstition (Dan. vii. 25); but it also tends to banish true religion, by diminishing respect for the Lord's day. (Mark xii. 9.)

250. *By whom are the various acts of public worship to be conducted?*

By ministers of the Word who have been lawfully appointed to the office of public instructors, and by none else. (See Rom. x. 15; Acts x. 33; Ephes. iv. 11, 12.)

251. *What are the several ordinances of public worship?*

Prayer, singing psalms, the Word read and preached, collection for pious purposes, baptism and the Lord's Supper, blessing the congregation, and the observance, on proper occasions, of days of fasting and thanksgiving, constitute the various ordinances of public worship. (Heb. x. 25; Psalm xcv. 1; Mark xiv. 26; Jas. v. 13; Mark xvi. 15, 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Acts ii. 41, 42; 1 Cor. xi. 23—34; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Matt. vi. 16; Neh. xii. 27.)

252. *In what spirit should the ordinances of public worship be attended to in?*

In a spirit of diligence, preparation, marked attention, faith and love, and a holy resolution to render obedience to the Divine law, accompanying all the exercises with fervent prayer, that the Most High would cause the blessing to descend in connexion with his own ordinances. (Acts ii. 42; 1 Chron. xvi. 36.)

253. *How are the various members of the congregation to join in prayer while the pastor is engaged in the solemn exercise?*

They are to "bestow close attention upon what is spoken, accompanying it with suitable and fervent ejaculations, offered in so secret a manner as not to attract the notice of others." (1 Chron. xvi. 36; 1 Cor. xiv. 26.)

254. *Are all the people to engage in the public praises of God in the Sanctuary?*

Yes: the command is—"O come, let us sing unto the Lord; let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation." (Psalm xcv. 1.) It is altogether dishonouring to the great object of worship, when a choir *represents* the congregation in praise, and the great body of the people are silent in a part of Divine worship, so solemn and important!

255. *How are the various members of the Church to contribute of their substance for pious purposes?*

They are to contribute from a sense of duty, with a view to the glory of God, in a willing, cheerful, and liberal spirit, and as the Lord hath prospered them. (2 Cor. ix. 1—15; 1 Cor. x. 31, xvi. 2.)

256. *Do you consider that a tenth of their available income would be too much for Christians to devote to religious and benevolent purposes?*

I do not: I believe that strong presumptive evidence could be adduced from Scripture to show that a proportion of income, not less than a *tenth*, ought to be devoted by Christians to general benevolent religious purposes. (Gen. xxviii. 22; Matt. iii. 8; Prov. iii. 9; Luke viii. 12.)

257. *What are the duties which Christians OWE TO THEMSELVES?*

The duties which Christians owe to themselves are watchfulness over their own lives (Col. iii. 5); strict sobriety and temperance

(2 Pet. i. 6); purity in speech and conduct (James iii. 2; Matt. v. 37); government of spirit (Prov. xxv. 28); dutiful attention to their civil affairs (Rom. xii. 11; Prov. xxvii. 23); regard to their moral and Christian character, and to their privileges, civil and religious (3 John 12; Eccl. ix. 1; Acts xxii. 25); and unremitting attention to the best interests of their immortal souls. (2 Pet. iii. 14; Mark xiii. 37.)

258. *What are the DUTIES WHICH CHRISTIANS OWE TO OTHERS?*

These may be classified in a *threefold* manner: first, duties which they owe to man as such; second, duties which they owe to the Church; and, thirdly, the various relative duties of life.

259. *What duties does the Christian owe to man, as such?*

The Christian owes to his fellow-creatures veracity in speech (Zech. viii. 16); integrity and equity in all his transactions (Mark x. 19); charity, courteousness, sympathy, help, protection, and other good offices. (1 Pet. iii. 8; Luke x. 36, 37; Matt. v. 44.)

260. *What are the duties which the Christian is under obligation to perform as a member of the Church?*

Christians are bound duly to attend on the private, social, and public ordinances of religion (1 John 1—3; Phil. i. 5); to render a dutiful

submission to those who are set over them in the Lord (Heb. xiii. 17; 1 Tim. v. 17); to submit, when necessary, to the righteous discipline of the Church (1 Tim. v. 20; Heb. xiii. 17); to bear a conscientious part in all that relates to the maintenance and extension of the Redeemer's cause (Matt. x. 10; 2 Cor. ix.); to discharge faithfully the stated and occasional duties of brotherly love (John xiii. 35); and to pray and labour for the peace and prosperity of Zion. (Ps. cxxii 6—9.)

261. *What do you intend by the relative duties of life?*

I intend those duties which flow from the several positions or relations in which man is placed by the Most High. These relations are those of husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, ruler and subject, and neighbour and neighbour.

262. *What are the respective duties of husband and wife?*

One of the most important conjugal duties, and one which may be said to comprehend all the others, is love. (Ephes. v. 25.) This will lead to strict fidelity to the marriage covenant (1 Pet. iii. 7); the preservation of domestic peace (Matt. v. 9; Prov. vii. 14); mutual sympathy and watchfulness over one another's souls. (1 Sam. i. 8; 1 Cor. vii. 16.) And while it is the special duty of the husband to defend his wife from harm, and to provide for the temporal and spiritual wants of a family, it is

the duty of the wife to place herself under his guardianship, and to aid in the performance of domestic duties (1 Tim. v. 8; Prov. xxxi); and both are to act with a view to the final account. (1 Cor. vii. 29, 30.)

263. *What are the duties of Parents?*

It is the duty of parents to pray for their children, both before and after their birth; to instruct them in divine things; to set a proper example before them; to use, when necessary, the rod of correction; to make provision for their temporal and spiritual wants; and to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. (Isa. xlix. 15; 1 Tim. v. 8; Prov. xxix. 15; Job. i. 5; Prov. xxii. 6.)

264. *What are the duties of children?*

Children are bound by the most sacred ties to love (Gen. xli. 29), fear (Lev. xix. 3; Prov. xxxi. 28), and obey their parents (Ephes. vi. 1—4.) They are also, when necessary, to provide, as far as possible, for their temporal necessities (1 Tim. v. 4); to pray for them, and, in a prudent manner, to bear with and conceal their infirmities. (Gen. ix. 22—27; Prov. xxiii. 22.)

265. *What are the duties of masters?*

Masters are to have a regard to the moral and religious character of those in their employment (Psalm ci. 6; Gen. xxxix. 3, 4); and while careful to assign them suitable wages for their work (Jas. v. 4), they are also

to treat them in a kindly spirit, allowing them sufficient time for the exercises of religion, and endeavouring to train them up in the fear of the Lord. (Gen. xviii. 19.)

266. *What are the duties of servants?*

Servants ought to perform the work assigned them conscientiously, honestly, diligently, and cheerfully. (Titus ii. 9, 10; Col. iii. 22—24; Prov. xviii. 9.) They are also to entertain a reverential regard for their masters, to pray for them (1 Tim. vi. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 18); and submit with meekness when rebuked for their faults. (1 Pet. ii. 18—20.)

CHAPTER V.

RELATIONS SUSTAINED BY THE REFORMED
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

267. *What do you intend by the relations of the Reformed Presbyterian Church?*

I intend the position assumed by the Reformed Presbyterian Church in regard to other Presbyterian bodies, and also in relation to the civil institutions of the nation in which Providence has cast our lot.

268. *Does not the expression, "relations of the Reformed Presbyterian Church," necessarily evoke the idea of her peculiar or distinguishing principles?*

It does.

269. *What are the peculiar or distinguishing principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church?*

As has been hinted in a former chapter (see Ques. 79), I do not consider it correct to represent the distinguishing principles of the Church as amounting to a certain definite

number. Contrast or comparison gives rise to *distinguishing* principles, and the latter can be enumerated only on the principle of selecting a given object of comparison. The following have, generally, been exhibited as distinguishing principles of the Covenanted Reformation:—The universal supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ; the supreme and ultimate authority of the Divine law, as regards man, in all the relations of life; the spiritual independence of the Church of Christ; the duty of public social Covenanting, and the continued obligation of the British Covenants; the duty of nations favoured with the Word of God to acknowledge Christ's sovereignty, by owning the true religion, and having a regard to the authority of the Bible in all legislative, judicial, and administrative acts; the right and duty of dissent from an immoral constitution of civil government; and the application of these doctrines, in the way of practical testimony, in opposition to existing evils.

270. *May not the whole of the distinguishing principles of the Covenanting Church be classified under ANY ONE OF A NUMBER OF THE GREAT LEADING DOCTRINES OF SCRIPTURE?*

Yes: the *peculiar* doctrines of the Church of the Second Reformation are not *peculiar* in the sense of being *additional or opposed to, distinct from, or contrasted with*, the doctrines of Scripture, as they are all capable of being deduced, as legitimate results, from any one

of a number of the grand leading doctrines of Scripture; as, for example, the supreme universal Headship of Christ, the doctrine of public social covenanting, or that of the duty of men, in all the relations of life, to subordinate themselves to the Divine will as made known in the Bible.

271. *Are the above-enumerated principles professed only by the Reformed Church?*

I am not free to answer this question in the affirmative. It is, perhaps, a fact, that there is not a single one of the distinguishing principles of the Reformed Church but is *theoretically* avowed by some one of the several ecclesiastical denominations.

272. *Wherein, then, lies THE GRAND DISTINGUISHING FEATURE WHEREBY THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IS DISTINGUISHABLE FROM ALL OTHER DENOMINATIONS?*

This grand distinguishing feature CONSISTS IN THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF A NUMBER OF THE ABOVE-NAMED PRINCIPLES OR DOCTRINES, AND MORE ESPECIALLY THAT OF THE SUPREME HEADSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST AS MEDIATOR OVER ALL THINGS, CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTIC.

273. *You consider, then, that the faithful, practical application of the doctrine of Christ's Headship will necessarily lead to all that is PECULIAR in the position of the Covenanting Church?*

I do ; and I trust that it is neither from egotism nor self-righteous pride that the assertion is freely made, *that in the full, faithful, practical application of the above doctrine the Reformed Presbyterian Church stands alone.*

SECTION I.

RELATIONS SUSTAINED BY THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN RESPECT TO THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

274. *Can you state the nature of the practical application of the doctrine of Christ's Headship over nations inculcated by the Reformed Presbyterian Church, in regard to the civil institutions of Britain?*

First, this question may be answered *positively*; and, according to this view, it may be observed that Reformed Presbyterians do not refuse to dwell on the soil, nor to be as "strangers within the land." They do not refuse to love their country with a true and patriotic regard; they do not refuse to pray unto the Lord for the peace and wellbeing of the land, that God would advance His own

cause, and overturn or remove what is evil; they do not refuse to promote, as much as in them lies, all the Scriptural ends of civil government, when such can be done without acknowledging the lawfulness of authority constituted on immoral principles; they do not refuse to pay a due share of the common taxation; yea, even to imposts of an oppressive nature, if not enacted expressly for an immoral purpose, nor required as a pledge of subjection, they are willing, for wrath's sake, to submit. Nor do they refuse to seek the nation's good, by a peaceable deportment, the support of whatever is moral and praiseworthy, and in any way not inconsistent with the Divine Word.

275. *What is the second or negative reply to this question?*

According to the second or negative view, it may be remarked, that Reformed Presbyterians cannot recognise, as the moral ordinance of God for good, that which is immoral and anti-Christian, as to a fearful extent the British Government now is; they cannot accept office under such a constitution; they cannot swear unqualified oaths of allegiance to its administrators, nor offer up for them unqualified prayers; nor can they aid in sending representatives to Parliament by the exercise of the elective franchise, nor act in any way so as to acknowledge, as the moral ordinance of God, what is immoral and anti-Christian.

276. *Why do Reformed Presbyterians deem it dutiful to dissent from and protest against many things connected with the civil institutions of Great Britain?*

They do so for two reasons:—*first*, because the British constitution homologates many things which are not only erroneous, immoral, and unscriptural, but even anti-Christian in their character; and, *secondly*, because they have been taught in Scripture that it is the duty of Christ's witnesses, not only to guard against being partakers of the national guilt, but also to protest against "the throne of iniquity, which frameth mischief by a law."

277. *What are some of the evils in the British Constitution to which you allude?*

One very great evil is THE ERASTIAN SUPREMACY of the British Crown. Christ is given to be Head over all things to His Church (Ephes. i. 22); yet the British monarch "is vested with all power, to exercise all manner of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical but by and under the king's majesty, who hath full power to hear and determine all manner of cases ecclesiastical, and to reform and correct all vice, sin, errors, and heresies whatsoever." *

278. *What other evil do you allude to?*

* See Act 26th Henry VIII., cap. 1.

In some respects, the very *constitution and claims* of the high court of Parliament are inconsistent with the Headship of the Redeemer. The constituent parts of a Parliament are the king, the Lords spiritual and temporal, and the Commons. The monarch sits in Parliament, in his royal capacity, as supreme head of the Church. The lords spiritual—bishops and archbishops—an order in direct opposition to the law of Christ, hold their seat as ecclesiastical persons exercising lordship over God's Church; and the claims of this supreme court are in some respects Erastian.*

279. *Can you specify any other evils?*

Yes: Prelacy is made an essential part of the constitution, and the monarch, at his coronation, solemnly swears to support the religion established by law. Popery might also be said to form an integral part of the constitution, being magnificently endowed in the Popish College of Maynooth, and in twenty-four out of the thirty-eight British colonies; and, even till the present day, the English Government gives £160,000 per annum to the idol temples of India! †

280. *Are not the honours of Christ's Headship derogated from by the way in which indivi-*

* See Blackstone, vol. 1, pp. 153—160.

† See Dr. Duff's Speech in General Assembly of Free Church, 1852.

duals are admitted to places of power and trust in the nation?

Most clearly. The Divine law requires that able men, and men of good moral and religious character, should be raised to places of power and trust (see Deut. i. 13; Eccl. x. 16; 2 Sam. xxiii. 3); whereas, in these kingdoms, Papists and Infidels, &c., are raised to authority and influence.

281. *But is it not PERSECUTION to prevent any person, who pays a due proportion of the common taxation, from enjoying the honours and emoluments of the State?*

By no means: there is a *right* and *wrong* in religion and politics, as well as in everything else; and those who choose the *false* have no right to claim the privileges accorded to those who embrace the *true*. To admit indiscriminately to political privileges the righteous and the wicked—those who are destitute of moral character as well as those who fear God—is to prepare the way for the approach of national judgments, and it may be, ultimately, for the prostration of all national virtue.

282. *Do we not also discover a total disregard to the honours of the Redeemer's crown in the way in which the various religious bodies are endowed?*

Yes: a low political expediency seems invariably to actuate the donors, as no religious

denomination is endowed *because it holds the truth*, but simply because it is deemed *expedient* to do so. This is quite apparent from the fact, that the same hand which endows Prelacy and orthodox *Presbyterianism* does the same for Socinianism, Popery, and even Hindoo idolatry.

283. *Are there not also many other evils which militate against the honours of Christ's crown.*

Alas! yes. The wicked acts of Charles II.'s reign are still allowed to disgrace the statute-book. At the Revolution the attainments of the Second Reformation were not restored; by the Incorporating Union between England and Scotland (1707), the Solemn League, and most of the public proceedings consequent on that deed, are virtually annulled; and, in consequence of the Bible being rejected as the basis of legislation, a flood of practical immoralities abound, as the systematic desecration of the holy Sabbath, &c.

284. *But, as no human system can be perfect, and as there are many things in connexion with the British Constitution which are most excellent, is it not factious, and even sinful, to refuse to homologate the civil institutions of Britain?*

It is freely granted that there are many noble features in the British Constitution. By it provision is made for securing *the rights of man*, as fully, perhaps, as is done in any other nation. But the same cannot be said of *the rights of God*, as it can hardly admit of a

doubt that the existence of the above-mentioned evils prove Great Britain still to be ONE OF THE HORNS OF THE BEAST, and as such she is to be testified against by Christ's witnesses. (See Rev. xiii. 1, &c.)

285. *Because Reformed Presbyterians cannot conscientiously swear unqualified oaths of allegiance to the British Crown, nor homologate the British Constitution, are they, on this account, to be stigmatised with the name of rebels?*

By no means. The epithets, "fanatics," "anti-government men, rebels," &c., may be flung forth by those whose judgments are vitiated or weak; but it is a far other thing to substantiate the truth of such charges. Although "Covenanters" cannot swear unqualified oaths of allegiance, &c., neither can they join with any improper association, nor employ any unscriptural methods of seeking to remove the evils against which they protest. Truth, the Word of God faithfully applied, not rebellion, is the weapon they would wield.

286. *On what grounds do the members of the Reformed Presbyterian Church refuse to exercise the elective franchise?*

The grounds of their refusal are contained in the following statement:—*First.* Every person who enters the British Parliament is required previously to take certain oaths, binding himself to the full extent of the national compact. He must swear "to be faithful

and bear true allegiance" to the sovereign, in maintaining and executing the "statutes, laws, and customs of the realm"; or, in other words, he swears to support the constitution as by law established. *Secondly.* The constitution, as is shown above, binds to, or embodies, systems which are not only immoral and unscriptural, but also anti-Christian, in their character. *Thirdly.* The elector employs the person elected to act on his own behalf, or to do what it would be impossible for all the electors to perform *personally*. Hence, Reformed Presbyterians cannot vote at elections, under present circumstances, because they cannot swear to support—no, not for an hour—the evils inherent in the constitution. They should have no objection, however, to exercise the elective franchise, were they permitted to do so without "doing," and *swearing* to do, "evil that good may come."

287. *Why do Reformed Presbyterians refuse to offer up unqualified prayers for the powers that be and the constitution?*

Because by so doing they would be solemnly calling upon God to support and perpetuate that which, in their profession, they have declared to be immoral, unscriptural, and even anti-Christian.

288. *But does not a refusal to employ the form of prayer generally used by others for those in authority subject those refusing to the charge of acting in opposition to the Scriptures?*

The very opposite. Covenanters are not ignorant of the command to pray for kings and those in authority; they are aware that this is said to be "good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved"; but, at the same time, they are anxious to attach proper ideas to every such precept and command. They are persuaded that it is a Scriptural duty to guard their prayers for "the powers that be," so as not to homologate what is immoral in the existing system. But when unqualified prayer is offered for its stability, will it not be understood "as a petition that it may be preserved *just as it is*, in all its integral parts—Popery, Prelacy, and Erastianism"?

289. *But does not Jeremiah command the Jewish captives at Babylon to seek the peace of the city whither they were carried captives, "AND TO PRAY UNTO THE LORD FOR IT"?*

He does (see Jer. xxix. 7); and the command is in direct accordance with the views and practice of Reformed Presbyterians. They *do* seek the peace of the nation, and they *do* pray to God for it; but they would desire to pray in such a way as not to homologate what is unscriptural, immoral, and anti-Christian. That the Jewish captives were not commanded to employ "unqualified prayers" for the city of their captivity, is clear from the 51st chap. of Jeremiah, in which we have a sublime prediction of Babylon's overthrow. Hence, it is

absurd to assert that the captives are commanded to pray for the upstanding of that which God denounces, and declares that He will utterly destroy.

290. *Why do Reformed Presbyterians refuse to accept office under the British Constitution?*

By so doing, they would homologate that which, in their profession, they have declared to be immoral and unscriptural.

291. *But does the fact of an individual accepting office under the British Crown necessarily pledge the individual to the whole extent of the national compact?*

Most certainly. The British constitution is a national compact, to which rulers and subjects bind themselves by solemn oaths; and no one can be a member of the national body politic, or vote for a member of Parliament, or hold any office, civil, ecclesiastical, or military, in connexion with the British Government, without being pledged to the whole extent of the national compact.

292. *But is it not a fact that Joseph, Daniel, and Nehemiah accepted office under heathen monarchs?*

Yes: Joseph was made second ruler over all the land of Egypt; Daniel was proclaimed third ruler in the kingdom of Babylon, and was afterwards made chief of the three presidents, who were over one hundred and twenty

princes, in the kingdom of Darius; and Nehemiah held a distinguished place under the Persian monarchy.

293. *If then, Joseph, Daniel, and Nehemiah accepted office, with the Divine approbation, under heathen monarchs, with what consistency can it be argued that Reformed Presbyterians may not lawfully accept office under the British Crown.*

The cases are not at all parallel. The government of Britain is *constitutional*, whereas those of Babylon and Persia were *despotisms*. Joseph, Daniel, and Nehemiah had substantially committed to them the whole administration of the respective kingdoms in which they lived, and we have no reason to suppose that these pious men were required to bind themselves in any way to uphold immoral constitutions, or to support what was opposed to the will of God; whereas, in Britain, all the members of the national society, rulers and ruled, are mutually bound by oath to maintain the whole complex system denominated the British Constitution.

294. *Reformed Presbyterians refusing to take any part in the political movements of the day, by what means do they propose to aid in introducing that glorious era when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.*

As time-honoured agencies, which the Lord

hath owned during the past in promoting reformation, they would employ the preaching of the Gospel and the other means of grace; a testimony for the whole of Christ's truth in opposition to all error; practical co-operation with others, as far as that testimony will allow, in all that relates to the public good; and the inculcation of Scriptural truth, in regard to civil as well as religious concerns.

SECTION II.

RELATIONS SUSTAINED BY THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH WITH RESPECT TO OTHER PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

295. *Is it safe or dutiful to institute inquiries with respect to real or supposed differences, among professing Christians?*

Yes. In Psalm cxli. 5, the result of faithful expostulation is spoken of as "a kindness," and as "an excellent oil" which shall not break the head. In Lev. xix. 7, the command is given, "thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him." In 1 Thes. v, 21, the Christian is urged to "prove

all things," and to hold fast that which is good. Paul withstood Peter to the face because he was to be blamed (Gal. ii. 11); and Peter shows that it is a Christian duty to be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh him a reason of the hope that is in him with meekness and fear. (1 Peter iii. 15.)

296. *Are the points of difference or agreement among the various Orthodox Presbyterian Churches the more numerous?*

It is a matter of thankfulness to God that the grounds of agreement among all the Evangelical Churches—and more so among Orthodox Presbyterians—are more numerous, than the points of difference. Orthodox Presbyterians not only substantially agree (at least theoretically) in the extensive range of doctrines laid down in the Westminster Confession of Faith, but also in relation to the form of Church Government and the mode of Christian worship; whereas, the grounds of difference may be reduced to a few doctrinal and practical points.

297. *Have you not said above (see question 272) that the practical application of the doctrine of Christ's Headship, constitutes the grand distinguishing feature whereby the Covenanting Church is distinguishable from other denominations?*

Yes: and although the points of difference resulting from the practical application of this

doctrine may be few in number, they are not, on this account, the less important.

298. *When you speak of the relations sustained by the Covenanting Church in respect to other Presbyterian bodies, what particular Churches do you allude to ?*

I allude particularly to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, the Free Church of Scotland, the Established Church of Scotland, the United Presbyterian Church, and the Associate Synod of Original Seceders.

299. *Wherein does the GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN IRELAND act unfaithfully with respect to Christ's Headship ?*

She does so in a *fourfold* manner :—*First*, by repudiating the ancient Covenanted Constitution, in Church and State, of these once covenanted lands ; *secondly*, by homologating the present Unscriptural, Prelatic, Erastian, Popish, and Infidel constitution of Britain ; *thirdly*, by acquiescing in various unscriptural political measures ; and *fourthly*, by manifesting a marked disregard to the claims of the Redeemer, in the department of ecclesiastical discipline.

300. *But does the Presbyterian Church in Ireland repudiate the ancient Covenanted Constitution of these lands ?*

Undoubtedly she does, at least practically. As illustrative of the truth of this assertion, it might be shown that, during the period of the

Second Reformation, no person could be admitted to a seat in the legislature without a public profession of Christianity, according to the Scriptural and Protestant acceptation of that term; whereas, the Irish Presbyterian Church homologates a constitution by which Infidels, Socinians, and Papists are admitted to places of power and trust in the nation. Again, notwithstanding oft-repeated boasts about being the proper representatives of the Scottish martyrs, the Irish Presbyterian Church refuses to own the continued obligation of the British covenants!

301. *But are not the ministers of the General Assembly required to acknowledge, at their ordination, "the moral obligation of public religious Covenanting"?*

Yes: but this acknowledgment, as made by the ministers of the Assembly, appears to mean just nothing, as the continued obligation of the British Covenants is not owned by that body, nor is any new covenant entered into. Without insinuating that the design of inserting the above question among those put to ministers at their ordination was to get rid of the British covenants, under the idea of a vague acknowledgement of them, it is evident that it admirably subserves this purpose.

302. *How can it be shown that the General Assmblly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland homologates the British Constitution?*

First, it is evident from the exercise of the elective franchise, and a willingness to accept such civil offices of power and trust as can be obtained—including, of course, the swearing of unqualified oaths of allegiance; *secondly*, it may be shown to follow as a native consequence from the practice of offering up unqualified prayers for those in authority; *thirdly*, the receipt of *Regium Donum*, on the terms on which it is obtained by that body, implies a homologation of the constitution; and, in the *fourth* place, oft repeated declarations of loyalty prove the same thing.

303. *Does not the general practice of offering up unqualified prayers for those in authority, on the part of Presbyterian ministers, imply a homologation of the constitution?*

It does. Such prayers either mean *nothing*, or they intend that the Most High is supplicated to preserve the corrupt civil institutions of Britain just as they are, including Popery, Prelacy, and Erastianism! That the latter impression is produced on the mind of every hearer, will scarcely be disputed.

304. *Is not the receipt of Regium Donum, by the Irish Presbyterian Church, derogatory of the honours of the Redeemer's crown, and a homologation of the British Constitution?*

It is. It cannot be denied, that at one time an oath of allegiance was required in order to the receipt of *Regium Donum*, and that such

an oath would still be taken, if required, is a thing understood on the part of the donors. *Regium Donum* has, at all times, been given on Erastian principles, and with a total disregard to the honours of the Redeemer's crown, and the reception of the gift constitutes the recipients partakers of other men's sins.

305. *How do you show that Regium Donum has always been given on mere political and Erastian principles?*

This is evident from the terms of the respective grants.

306. *When, and on what terms, was the first grant given?*

The first grant was made by Charles II., in 1672. This grant consisted of £600, which was to be divided in equal proportions among the ministers who were in the country in 1660. This grant was given "of his Majesty's own mere motion," and was marked in the accounts as "secret service" money.

307. *When was the next grant made?*

In 1690, by William III. This grant, which is said by advocates for the *Regium Donum* to have been its proper origin, consisted of £1,200 per annum, and the following are the terms in which the original order is expressed:—"Being assured of the peaceable and dutiful temper of our said subjects, and sensible of the losses they have sustained, and their constant labour to unite the hearts of others in

zeal and loyalty towards us, we do hereby, out of our royal bounty, give and grant," &c. This grant was given to the Presbyterian ministers because they had increased the number and zeal of William's political adherents, and out of his own royal bounty; that is, it was Erastian and political in its origin and object.*

308. *When was the third grant of Regium Donum given?*

On the accession of Queen Anne, in 1701. The conditions of this grant were still more Erastian than those of the former. Instead of the former designation—"to Presbyterian ministers"—the patent reads thus:—"To be distributed among such of the Nonconforming ministers, by warrant from the Lord Lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors for the time being, in such manner as he or they shall find it necessary for our service, or the good of the kingdom." That is, if any minister dared to act, speak, or preach, so as to offend the government, the Lord Lieutenant would deprive him of his bounty. †

309. *When was the next regular addition made to the Regium Donum?*

In 1784, an addition of £1,000 was made to the Donum, by the government of George III. This grant appears to have been forced from government by the threatening aspect of the times, and by the increasing power of the

* See Reid's History, Vol. II., p. 384.

† See Reid's History, Vol. III. pp. 10, 11.

Irish Volunteers. In relation to the smallness of the grant, the Duke of Portland, the then Lord Lieutenant, expressed a regret that the conduct of the government was "foolish and impolitic, as it deprived government of the most valuable purchase which it ever had of making in Ireland."* It was at this time that the Seceding Synod first received a share in Royal Bounty. The first grant made to that body was £500 per annum, and the grounds on which it was made were as secular as those on which the grant was made to the Synod of Ulster.

310. *When was the next addition made to the Bounty?*

In 1792, shortly after a general election; and the large addition of £5,000 which was now made, "during pleasure," can be viewed in no other light than as payment for electioneering zeal on behalf of two noble candidates for Parliamentary honours.

311. *What is the next step in the history of Royal Bounty?*

That proposed and carried by Lord Castle-reagh in 1803, when the ministers were divided into three classes, and, as they belonged to the first, second, or third class, they received respectively £100, £75, and £50. The addition made at this time amounted to £8,641 2s.

* See Dickson's Narrative, pp. 291, 292.

312. *What induced Lord Castlereagh to have recourse to the system of classification?*

The secret of the movement is disclosed in one of his lordship's letters to Mr. Addington, in which he writes that the Presbyterian body had "partaken so deeply of the popular and democratic politics of the country as to be an object much more of jealousy than of support to government. I am of opinion that it is only through a considerable internal fermentation of the body, coupled with some change of system, that it will put on a different system, and acquire better habits."*

313. *In addition to classification, what other measure did his lordship adopt in order to induce a change in the "temper and habits" of the Ulster Presbyterians?*

The Donum was made a grant from the State, not to the body as such, but to each minister; and his receipt of it depended on his producing to the Lord Lieutenant two certificates, one from the Presbytery to which he belonged, attesting his ordination, and another signed by two magistrates, attesting that he had taken and subscribed the oath of allegiance to the reigning sovereign. The object of the government in these measures was declared to be to make the ministers "more dependent,

* See Memoirs, &c., of Lord Castlereagh, vol. IV., pp. 224, 225.

and render them more amenable to government." *

314. *Is not the reception of Regium Donum by Presbyterian ministers now—knowing as they do the original nature and design of the grant—a virtual homologation of the degradation of their fathers?*

Undoubtedly it is. From first to last the Regium Donum has been the price of political subserviency; and, although the terms of its reception may now be a little relaxed, there are still terms; and the reception of the grant without explanation or protest by the present race of ministers is an evident acquiescence in the degradation of those who have gone before.

315. *But have not several modifications been introduced into the working of the system since the days of Castlereagh?*

Yes: the classification was abandoned in 1838, and a uniform stipend of £75, Irish currency, was promised to each minister; and, in 1840, the regulation was issued that no Bounty would be paid unless the minister received at least £35 of independent yearly stipend. *Government regulations still exist, and these have been altered again and again by Government WITHOUT CONSULTING THE ASSEMBLY.*

* See Memoirs, &c., Vol. III., p. 388.

316. *In addition to the homologation of the sin of the government in granting Regium Donum on principles subversive of Christianity, what are some of the more practical evils connected with the receipt of this grant?*

The receipt of Regium Donum by the Irish Assembly affords government a pretext for the endowment of Socinianism and of the Popish College of Maynooth; and it is to be feared that it has prevented that body, *as such*, from exposing the evils of the British Constitution, and also, that it has led to a sinful acquiescence with various unscriptural acts of British legislation, as the Emancipation Act, the Irish National System of Education, the late Marriage Act, &c.

317. *How can it be shown that the claims of the Redeemer, as regards ecclesiastical discipline, are overlooked by the General Assembly?*

Properly speaking, there are no distinct "terms of communion" in connexion with the General Assembly, but persons of opposing religious sentiment are freely admitted to the sealing ordinances of the Church. It is also too true that a full profession of religion—including the daily performance of family worship—is not made a term of communion; but, the fact of taking a seat in a place of worship is deemed sufficient to constitute an individual a church member. It is no uncommon thing, moreover, to make such a difference between the sacraments as that persons who may be

considered unworthy of a seat at the Lord's table, or who habitually neglect this ordinance, have no difficulty in obtaining baptism for their children.*

318. *Wherein does the ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF SCOTLAND act unfaithfully with regard to the Redeemer's Headship?*

This Church can only be said to be nominally Presbyterian, as her Presbyterianism rests on no higher ground than its agreeableness to the will of the people. Her position is altogether subversive of the Second Reformation. She is the veriest creature of Erastian State control. Her creed—the Confession of Faith—is received by her at the dictation of the State, the Act of 1647 being disregarded. By submitting to the iniquitous yoke of patronage, she homologates the monstrous claims of the State to coerce the Church in the formation of the pastoral relation; to suspend spiritual censures; to interdict the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments; to reverse decisions of Church courts; and, in fact, to stay all process of discipline, if in any matter the law of patronage is infringed. As regards discipline, the ignorant, the irreli-

* The reply to question 317 must be taken in a considerably qualified sense, when applied to a number of those congregations in connexion with the Assembly, which were formerly under the care of the Secession Synod.

gious, and even the immoral are admitted to the most solemn ordinances of the Church !

319. *What evils, in connexion with the FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, are condemned by the Testimony of the Reformed Presbyterian Church?*

With the exception of what has been advanced in regard to *Regium Donum*, all that has been said with respect to "the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland" may, with equal force, be applied to "the Free Church of Scotland." Although this Church has made a full and Scriptural declaration with regard to the exclusive headship of Christ over His Church, and has taken a noble stand in relation to the Redeemer's cause generally; yet, it is evident that her claim to be the legitimate representative of the Church of the Second Reformation, is repudiated by her own assumed position, which position is, in several particulars, condemned by the Testimony of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

320. *What are some of these particulars?*

First, the continued obligation of the British Covenants has never been owned by the Free Church; *secondly*, that Church has never assumed a Scriptural position with respect to the iniquitous law of patronage; *thirdly*, she has manifested a disposition to cleave too tenaciously to the Revolution Settlement and Treaty of Union; and, *fourthly*, she holds a connexion

with an unscriptural and Antichristian State, quite inconsistent with many of her noble contents.

321. *Is it a fact that the Free Church refuses to own the continued obligation of the British Covenants?*

It is. Individual members may have spoken well of these Covenants, but the body as such refuses to own their continued obligation.

322. *How do you show that the Free Church has never assumed a Scriptural position with respect to Patronage?*

The Free Church cannot, with much propriety, be designated an anti-patronage Church; for, although she has declared (see Free Church Catechism, Question 198) that patronage is a grievance, and the main cause of the difficulties in which she was involved; yet, her conflict all along was merely for the maintenance of the "Veto Law." Now, the "Veto Law" homologated patronage, and was framed with the design of interfering with it "to the least possible extent";* and, instead of "reviving the call"—as Ques. 193, in Free Church Catechism, asserts it did—it actually *abolished* it, and instead thereof, substituted the absence of formal protest.

323. *Does not the "Claim of Right and the Protest" bind the Free Church irretrievably to the Revolution Settlement and Treaty of Union?*

* See Reply to Sir James Graham's Letter.

It does. Although the Free Church admits that there were many and serious defects in the Revolution Settlement, yet, in the resolutions of 1838, she asserts of the Revolution Church what never was true, namely, "that in all matters touching the doctrine, discipline, and government of *this Church* (the Revolution Church), her judicatories possess an exclusive jurisdiction, founded on the Word of God." Such an exclusive jurisdiction the Revolution Church never did possess, as she has always been under the bondage of Erastianism; yet the "settlement of the Church effected at the Revolution, and solemnly guaranteed by the Act of Security and Treaty of Union," is *the foundation* of the Free Church's protest against the doings of the civil power. Hence it is evident that while, in the main, the noble contendings of those who framed the Free Church, were scripturally right, they were at the same time legally, historically, and constitutionally wrong.

324. *Is not the connexion which the Free Church holds with the civil power quite inconsistent with her claim of being the representative of the ancient Covenanted Church of Scotland?*

It is. That she holds a connexion with the State is clear from her own words: "This Church, valuing highly, as she ever has done, her *connexion* on the terms contained in the statutes, &c., *with the State*," &c.* Again, this

* See Claim of Right and Protest.

connexion leads her to acknowledge the civil constitution, and by her members to swear allegiance to it, and take part in the general management of affairs; and hence she becomes committed to the support of that very supremacy which she proclaimed, at least in her own case, to be iniquitous and intolerable!

325. *Wherein does the UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH act unfaithfully with regard to the Redeemer's Headship?*

She does so by asserting a principle which not only robs the Redeemer of the honours of His supremacy over nations, but which also exercises a baneful influence on religion and morality, and which, when followed out to its legitimate results, necessarily leads to national infidelity.

326. *What is this principle?*

It is, that, even in lands possessing the Scriptures, civil rulers—as such—have nothing to do with religion; and that nations—as such—can render no homage to Christ, nor in any way give national countenance to His cause. (Hist. Test., p. 245.)

327. *Is not this principle in direct opposition to Scripture?*

Most clearly it is, as see the passages quoted under questions 209, 210.

328. *Is it not also subversive of the Second Reformation?*

Yes: it leads to the disowning of the British Covenants, and renders national Covenanting unwarrantable under the New Testament dispensation; and it also refuses nations the right of consecrating their power and resources to religious objects.

329. *How does this principle exercise a baneful influence on religion and morality?*

Political Atheism, by inculcating religious neutrality, and refusing to subordinate national concerns to the Divine glory, cannot fail, ultimately, to destroy the morals as well as the religion of a nation. History remarkably confirms and illustrates the declaration that "the wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted." * Psalm xii. 8.

330. *What is the position of THE ORIGINAL SECESSION CHURCH with respect to the Redeemer's Headship over nations?*

This Church has made a full and Scriptural declaration with regard to Christ's Headship; and in general, as regards doctrine and practice, she approaches nearer to the Reformed Presbyterian Church than any other denomination; but, at the same time, she has declared sentiments which are quite inconsistent with her

* The observations made with regard to the "United Presbyterian Church" apply with equal force to "THE ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERY OF IRELAND," as that body may now be considered as virtually constituting a part of "the United Presbyterian Church."

Scriptural assertion as to the Headship of Christ over nations.

331. *What is the language of the Original Secession Church with respect to Christ's Headship over nations?*

In her "Testimony" she declares "that magistracy, like everything belonging to the kingdom of Providence, is put into Christ's hand, to be ordered in subserviency to the good of His Church." She also maintains "that it is the duty of nations and their rulers to regulate the whole of their conduct by the will of God."

332. *What are her declared sentiments which are inconsistent with the above statements?*

That "the public good of outward and common order to the glory of God" is the only end of magistracy; and that "the whole institution and end of that office are cut out by, and lie within, the compass of *natural principles*." Two inferences—inferences acknowledged to be legitimate by that Church—naturally follow from these statements, namely:—that the majority of a nation have a right to erect immoral and unscriptural institutions; and also that a protesting minority is bound to yield allegiance to the institutions which the majority may set up.

333. *What objections do you bring against the doctrine, that "the public good of outward and*

common order" is the only end of civil magistracy?

First, it militates against Christ's universal Headship, by excluding nations from the legislative control of the Redeemer; *secondly*, it is opposed to those passages of Scripture which represent civil rulers as under obligation to respect the religion of Jesus (see Isa. xlix. 23; lx. 10—12; Psal. ii. 10—12; Dan. vii. 14; Psal. lxxii. 11; Rev. i. 5, &c.); and, *thirdly*, it is in direct opposition to a fundamental principle of the Second Reformation.

334. *What objections do you offer against the doctrine that the minority are bound to acquiesce in whatever constitution "the body politic, or majority of a nation," may set up?*

First, such a doctrine is opposed to right reason, as it constitutes the majority of a nation the *arbiter* of right and wrong; *secondly*, it is unscriptural, as has been fully shown in Chap. III., Sec. VI.; and, *finally*, it is at variance with the practice of the most eminent of God's saints, as the "two witnesses" are represented as keeping themselves separate from the Antichristian government of the Latin earth for a period of 1,260 years. (Rev. xi.)

Note to question 330. What has been advanced with respect to the "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland," the "Original Secession," &c., may, for the most part, be applied to the "SECESSION SYNOD OF IRELAND," in whose "Reasons of Dissent" from the late deed of Union between the

335. *What do you say of those Churches which have entered into alliances with the British Government?*

As the British Government "wants those qualifications without which a union between Church and State can neither be lawful nor beneficial" (Hist. Test., p. 171), all those Churches which are confederate with it are in a position which is not only calculated to impede the free action of a Church, but which is also dishonouring to God, ensnaring to the conscience, and, in the present divided state of religious parties, politically and morally unjust.

336. *Do you believe that an alliance between Church and State is in itself, and in every case, unlawful?*

No, I do not. Although present establishments of religion are to be condemned as unscriptural, it is evident that the time is drawing near when God's two grand ordinances—Magistracy and the Ministry—shall be harmoniously united, each in its own sphere, to promote the Divine glory and the present and eternal well-being of man.

Secession Synod and the Synod of Ulster, we do not discover any very tangible ground of difference between that body and the "General Assembly," with the exception of an apparent desire for a higher degree of knowledge and uniformity in the faith, on the part of the office-bearers of the church, and also with respect to ecclesiastical discipline.

337. *When may an alliance between Church and State be lawfully entered into?*

When the parties entering into the alliance are possessed of a Scriptural character, and the terms of the alliance are also Scriptural.

338. *Has not the Reformed Presbyterian Church always maintained the establishment principle, while at the same time she has refused to partake of those corrupting bribes which are held forth by an unscriptural government?*

Yes: the ministers of this Church in Ireland have never asked for, and would not accept of, Regium Donum, which is freely dispensed to other Dissenters.

339. *On what grounds do you rest the belief that the principles of the Second Reformation shall yet extensively prevail, and that other Presbyterian bodies will be led ultimately to assume the position occupied by the Reformed Presbyterian Church?*

This conviction is grounded, *first*, on the fact that the principles of that Reformation are Scriptural; *secondly*, on the remarkable nature of their past success; *thirdly*, on the fervent prayers and expressed hopes of many martyrs in relation to their future extension; and, *finally*, on their peculiar adaptation to resist the floods of error and turn back the tide of

Popish aggression which have set in upon our guilty land. It is now the imperative duty of the friends of Protestantism to join, as one man, in the death-cry of the martyred Guthrie, when from the scaffold he exclaimed, "THE COVENANTS, THE COVENANTS, SHALL YET BE SCOTLAND'S" (and may we not also add, Britain's?) "REVIVING."

FINIS.